VOL. LXIX. PART VII.

Transactions
of
The Chartered Surveyors' Institution

SESSION 1936-1937.

AT THE ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

Held at the Chartered Surveyors' Institution, Monday, 10th May, 1937.

Mr. J. M. THEOBALD (President) in the Chair.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following new members were received by the PRESIDENT prior to the meeting, and signed the Register:—

Professional Associates:

HUGHES, GEOFFREY ARTHUR
WHITE, FREDERICK ARTHUR GOULD

A DISCUSSION took place on Mr. G. LESLIE HEAD'S Paper entitled

THE RENTAL VALUE OF LIGHT.

Mr. H. ARTHUR STEWARD (Hon. Secretary), in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Leslie Head for his kindness in writing the paper and for attending that evening to give a *résumé* of it, said he was very sorry that it should have happened to have fallen on that particular evening, two nights before the Coronation, which had probably materially affected the attendance.

Referring to Mr. Head's paper, he said that, after reading the paper through and struggling to master the various tables and graphs, he had felt very grateful when he read "There "is no royal road to valuation; instead there is a labyrinth "of twisting lanes, and at every turn the valuer must rely "upon his own judgment and experience." Was that not the whole essence of valuation—that the valuer had to rely upon his own judgment and experience?

The valuer had to estimate the worth of an article, and the worth was only what it would fetch in the open market; as to what it would fetch could only be estimated by experience of what an article of like character had sold for in the past. To give an example, as every surveyor knew, a rough cost of a building was often estimated as so much per foot cube, but that was only of use in one's estimate if one knew what a similar building had actually cost; for example, it would be useless if one knew a factory building cost 1*s.* per foot cube to imagine one could build, say, a block of flats at the same price. There must be some basis of like with like.

The degree of light obtainable in a room must obviously depend to a very large extent on the size of the windows, and as the days of a window tax had long passed, there was no difficulty, with modern steel construction, in increasing the number and size of windows to almost any extent.

As Mr. Head had said in his paper, there was tremendous value in reflected light; in fact a very large proportion of light to rooms in the central part of London and big cities was obtained by reflection in some form.

As every one knew, rooms from which no sight of the sky was possible at all could be very adequately lighted by reflectors hung at the correct angle outside the window. Personally he

had two such rooms in his offices not more than 100 yards from the present meeting, where on any reasonably light day the rooms were perfectly adequately lighted all over. It was admittedly necessary to keep the reflectors clean, but that was equally advisable with one's windows. Again, a large amount of reflected light could be obtained, as was again well known, from a white-glazed surface opposite.

Mr. Head measured his light to a large extent from visibility of sky. To be able to see the sky from the centre of a room was, of course, of great advantage, but there were very many rooms which were quite well lighted where that was not the case.

Perhaps if the town planning theorist who dreamt of Utopia and who had no regard to what was economically practical got his way, we should reach the stage of everybody in all parts of every room being able to see the sky ; but if so, the value of buildings in the centre of London would reach such a fantastic figure that nobody would be able to afford to occupy them, or else the hoped-for green belt around London would have to be pushed further out.

As Mr. Head had said, the amount of light required depended to a great extent on the particular trade or business carried on.

He remembered a light case where the trade being carried on was that of a second-hand jeweller who had to decide, while his customers were waiting in the shop, how much he could give for the jewels being offered him, and where he demonstrated, beyond doubt, the great importance of good light to his particular trade.

He agreed with Mr. Head that better lighted rooms in consequence of their being on higher floors of a building frequently did not command any better rent. The first and, possibly, the second floor of a block of flats would usually command better rents than the ground floor, but that was not on account of light, but because people did not pick a ground-floor flat for choice. For offices the advantage of easy accessibility on the ground floor usually outweighed, in normal circumstances, the increased light from upper floors.

Mr. Head's reference to the Rent Restriction Act (the short name for the imposing title of the Rent and Mortgage Interest Restrictions Act) would receive warm approval from all surveyors in his hope that there might shortly be seen the demise of this piece of legislation, which had been as much abused as any Act, and which caused innumerable delays during the past twenty years in rebuilding worn-out property, and which in many cases had made it impossible to do so.

When that happy day arrived they would be delighted to

allow Mr. Head to adopt the term "standard rent" for his own particular purpose.

All would agree that light must play a part in the valuation of property in cities, but, except in extreme cases, he himself doubted if it played in practice (though he agreed it should in theory) so large a part as Mr. Head's paper suggested.

As Mr. Head said, until one got reliable data as to the value placed by the public on light, the valuer must rely on his own judgment.

Mr. Head's paper and suggested data formed a laudable attempt to work out the proportion of value to be attributed to each, and the members would agree that they owed him a debt of gratitude for the time and trouble he had given to the preparation of the paper, and which should be helpful to all surveyors when dealing with the question of light.

Mr. Arnold G. Keen (Fellow), in seconding the vote of thanks, said at the outset that there were two points that he desired to make.

The first was that when one was dealing with a compensation case for light there were two quite definite tasks which had to be done. The first was to ascertain the facts with regard to the present and future condition of the light and to prepare diagrams. That was a task for a gentleman who called himself an "illumination expert," and when that gentleman had done that, his task was finished. It was then for the valuer to come in, and with the information on the diagrams before him, to turn the injury into terms of cash. It was that question of how to turn it into terms of cash which Mr. Head had discussed; and personally he very much hoped that those who were going to join in the debate would stick to that one point and not go wandering off into questions of modern methods of measuring light, or anything of that sort; because, as far as he knew, the present was the first occasion upon which anybody had come forward at the Institution with a practical proposal as to how that very difficult valuation could be made. With the paper before them, and the subsequent discussion, he thought valuers would probably be able to make a very big advance in formulating some sort of method for dealing with those cases. Mr. Head was offering a method by which valuers, when valuing light, could build up their figure in an intelligent manner and not simply make a leap in the dark.

The second point was this. In all cases of compensation for damage one always ran the risk that ultimately one's opinion would be tested by actual facts. One was asked to-day to

express an opinion as to what the damage would amount to in terms of money if a certain event took place. In many cases it might be years before the facts materialised on which one's opinion could be tested, and if one were wrong, other factors might have crept in to explain away one's error. That was not so in the case of light ; it might be a question of only a few weeks ; in fact the building might be constructed and the damage done before the compensation was ever settled. So that in those cases one must be careful not to rush in and seize an academic formula and hope that it would get one through, because one would be tested and probably tested very quickly. Therefore there was one word of warning to be uttered with regard to the paper, and that was that valuers must see that the result they got was not merely academic but was really a practical answer, and one which would stand being actually tested.

Dealing with the paper itself, the author had produced a schedule, and was, in effect, saying " Can we agree on what " should be the percentage of standard light for all sorts of " different types of property?" If valuers could do that they would at all events have made some progress, and personally he thought they now knew enough about light to be able to sit down and make some such schedule as Mr. Head had suggested. He did not agree with Mr. Head's schedule, nor did he agree with his percentages, and it could be seen that Mr. Head had left out whole groups of property. But at all events Mr. Head had made a concrete proposal, and personally he thought that, so far as Schedule I. was concerned, valuers could, broadly speaking, formulate some such schedule as that.

On the question of basic rent, what Mr. Head said was only logic, namely, that in the case of rent part of that rent was paid for the light and the other part was in respect of the space. Mr. Head had produced Schedule II., and, in effect, asked " Cannot we similarly agree on the percentages of rent for " light and space under similar categories as we have done in ' the case of Schedule I.? " There, he thought, Mr. Head was on more dangerous ground, and he thought that his schedule would have to be very elastic and that there would have to be many exceptions. At all events, for the sake of argument, he thought that some such schedule as Schedule II. might be agreed. Then Mr. Head went on to say " Having got as far as that, " let us prepare a graph." Personally he had read the paper a dozen times and had studied that graph very carefully. It was quite sound in its way, but the difficulty which he himself saw in Mr. Head's argument was in getting over that period in the middle of his curve when the rent declined suddenly.

It seemed to him that Mr. Head's S-shaped curve was really a little curve at the top and then a straight line down finishing in a little curve at the bottom.

He would agree that in the case of small claims, where the rent involved was small, very possibly Mr. Head's graph might work at each end, but he doubted whether it would work in the middle ; but, at all events, it did afford a basis for argument.

It was when he got to consequential damage that Mr. Head was faced with his most difficult problem. That arose in the case of a suite of rooms. One room had the light damaged and the other three had not, but the rent of the ones that were not damaged was depreciated because they were part of the whole. He had had the case of a bachelor's flat, consisting of a sitting-room, a bedroom, a kitchen, and bathroom. Damage had been done to the sitting-room, which had bare standard light, with the result that the rent of the whole flat, including the other rooms, had been diminished. How did Mr. Head suggest dealing with that? He had given three suggestions, in every one of which a very big item in the calculation had to be "assumed." If the valuer were going to assume as much as Mr. Head wanted him to do, by whichever method one arrived at one's answer it seemed that the valuer might just as well assume the whole thing.

It was a very difficult thing to say what that assumption should be, and it seemed to him that in many cases it might be safer if the valuer went straight for his answer.

Having read the paper many times and thought out what he was going to say, he had asked himself "What does this "criticism really come to?" He would therefore summarise his remarks as follows. He believed one could go as far as this. With regard to Mr. Head's first schedule, he thought it was a practicable proposition to agree to such a schedule. With regard to Schedule II. he thought Mr. Head was on more dangerous ground, but he thought that, providing the schedule was sufficiently elastic, it should be possible to evolve some such schedule. With regard to the graph, in cases where the injury and the compensation were small, or where the decrease of light would not be likely to involve change of user or change of tenant, then the graph might be a practical proposition. Where the injury was great and the amount of money involved was large, or where the effect of the injury would be that the premises would have to be used for some entirely different purpose, he thought the graph would probably fail. With regard to consequential damage, he doubted whether Mr. Head's proposal would be of any use in any case. Since valuing was not a precise science but an art,

and that factors had to be considered which rested on politics, high finance, taste, fashion, prejudice, and æsthetics, no machinery could ever be produced which would be infallible. At the same time he thought Mr. Head had made a very valuable contribution towards the solution of the problem, and he was sure valuers would do well to examine his proposals and see whether, even if they could not go the whole way, they could at all events go part of the way towards formulating some acceptable method of tackling the problem.

Mr. A. R. Craig Hall (Fellow) remarked that the paper was of especial interest to himself because he had for some time been using, in a very elementary manner, a method which had some resemblance to the method described by Mr. Head, and as he had had the opportunity of reading the paper some days ago he had been able to adapt and to refine his method to bring it into line with the data of Mr. Head's. Having done that, he had been able to plot a curve on Mr. Head's graph, which he had found to be very similar ; it was a little flatter at the top, but more acute in the middle and at the bottom.

The paper was full of many interesting points for discussion. The one about which he himself was chiefly exercised was the division of space-rent and light-rent. Did Mr. Head consider that that division was practicable ; and, if it was, was it advisable, because it seemed to open up an avenue of almost endless discussion on the exact and correct proportions of space-rent and light-rent? Taking, for example, a corner shop or office building, the value of that corner was made up of three elements—space, light, and position. Space value would combine the ordinary value of space in square feet, and an extra position value because of the corner site. Light value would be a combination of the value of ordinary light and an extra value for the additional light due to position. Position value would be common to both space value and light value, but could not be separated from each because position value itself included not only the value of the corner position as such, but also the value of the extra light because it was a corner. In such circumstances he did not think it was practicable to calculate pure space-rent and light-rent, and he thought that if the question of dividing these two elements could be removed altogether, it would assist the use of the formula.

Most valuers would have no difficulty in assessing compensation for diminution of light if they were in a position, first of all, to inspect the building in its original condition of obstruction, and subsequently be able to go and see it in its ultimate condition of obstruction. There was no reason in those circumstances why

a valuer should not be able to assess accurately the actual loss in rental value. Sometimes, however, one was called in to give advice in a case where the obstructing building was already erected, and if one had no knowledge of the affected building in its former condition, it was necessary to base a valuation upon daylight plans, and to form in one's own mind some method for devaluing light. He considered that that was where the real value of the paper lay, and the members' thanks were due to Mr. Head because he had presented a method of devaluing light which was both scientific and applicable.

Mr. H. G. May (Fellow) thought that one difficulty in dealing with the subject matter of the paper was that one had to make three assumptions, namely, standard rent, standard light-rent, and the rate of depreciation. If one had to exercise one's own judgment at three stages in a complicated process, it should not be difficult for a reasonable man who knew what he was doing to make one assumption right away, namely, the reduction in rental value due to a certain set of circumstances which were going to come about.

Mr. Head remarked that there had been extraordinary variations in opinions as to damage done by deprivation of light in the past. Personally he did not think that those variations in opinions were any more extraordinary in the case of light and air than they were in other compensation cases. He thought one could put down those variations of opinion as being due to human infallibility rather than that there was any difficulty in interpreting the facts as they were and as they would be.

The paper struck him, however, as being of extreme value in leading one's mind along a logical train of thought ; it presented a new and valuable method of approach to a difficult problem.

Another difficulty which had struck him had been that of attempting to present any sort of calculation of the kind under discussion in a Court or before any tribunal. Personally he would be very concerned if he had the duty of putting it before a judge.

Mr. Head referred to variations of standard rents, floor by floor, in a stack of offices one over the other. He had not, however, mentioned the effect in the reduction of traffic noise and of dust and the increase in amenities which appertained to offices on upper floors of buildings in congested areas ; personally he thought that those factors had to be taken into account in comparing rents on various floors.

In regard to the question of trade damage, Mr. Head said " You cannot have a rental claim and a trade claim at one and " the same time " ; but if a claimant was in occupation, it

seemed to him that his claim might be in two parts—one for damage to rental value, which was capitalised on the property table because it was damage to the property, and the other for consequential damage, such as for the re-arrangement of plant and machinery in a factory.

He felt that the paper was an extraordinarily valuable one, but he looked upon the method of calculation suggested with extreme caution ; he considered it could only be used as a method of approach to the problem and not as a means of accurate calculation, having regard to the many assumptions that had to be made.

Mr. P. V. Burnett, f.r.i.b.a. (Visitor), proposed to confine his remarks more to principles than to details. First of all, he thought the main reason why there had been such wild discrepancies in valuations during the last few years was that surveyors had not really understood daylight plans. He considered Mr. Head's lucid and simple explanation, although not strictly accurate, was, nevertheless, an excellent thing to publish in the Institution's *Journal*, because as daylight plans became better understood, there was not the slightest doubt that valuation would become so much easier. One of the biggest items which valuers had always guessed at previously became certain, and once they had got the light details certain, then the valuation was simplified.

When it came to Mr. Head's method, he thought that in principle the method of analysis which Mr. Head adopted was thoroughly sound, but personally he did not agree with it in regard to its detail.

There was only one practical point that he would put, namely, that before a valuer could decide upon the standard light for any room he must decide, firstly, upon a standard room. Rooms varied so much in character and in physical details that in every case under consideration the first thing which had to be borne in mind was the physical details of the room itself. Shape, for instance, was an essential detail to take into consideration. A room which was very wide and shallow needed a lower percentage of light than a room which was narrow and deep. The size of a room was also very important. Taking a large living room of 400 square feet which, according to Mr. Head's schedule, was entitled to 50 per cent. of adequate light, that would mean physically 200 square feet. Two hundred square feet was ample for all the normal purposes of a living room ; nobody would deny that. Taking, however, a small room of 150 square feet, 50 per cent. of that was only 75 square feet—which was not ample for the normal purposes of a living room. Then there was the height

—which was also very important. A low room would always appear considerable darker than a room of moderate height. A very high room would also appear dark. Therefore, undoubtedly, there was a tremendus amount of judgment to be used before any sort of stock percentages could be arrived at, and personally he would suggest that the first thing to decide was what was a standard room? and then put standard light to it. He did not think that anybody had ever been able to decide what a standard room was, but he threw out one suggestion in regard to it, namely, that it was a room with a proportion of 5 to 4 with the window in the short side. He did not know of any method of deciding upon height which could be regarded as standard, but most individuals on going into a room would be able to decide whether its proportion was reasonable and whether it was high or low.

All those things, he suggested, must be taken into consideration before a standard light could be laid down. Having got at a standard light, the analytical method which Mr. Head suggested was in his opinion a sound one, and was one which should be followed. At the same time it had got to be used with a tremendous amount of judgment at every stage ; but if it was used with proper judgment he thought the result would probably be reasonable. At any rate, he did not think there would be any doubt that it would be much more reasonable than the usual method of guess-valuation.

Mr. Percy J. Waldram (Fellow) said it was fitting that the author of a previous paper on a precisely similar subject should support the vote of thanks. He had sought an opportunity of doing so, not as a gracious formality to one who, not being a member was, in effect, a guest, but because, upon reading the paper, he had found so much in it that was good, and more particularly because he had found it to be an honest attempt to face all the difficulties without pretending that it was possible to magic them away by some mysterious formula. For that the author had earned his gratitude, and, he trusted, also that of the members.

At first sight the paper appeared to be extremely erudite, a fact which would immediately make any experienced valuer suspicious as to whether it were even worth reading, because valuations which depended upon rules and formulæ were notoriously unreliable. When one read it carefully, however, that proved to be due solely to a strange looking graph and two impressive tables of numerical equivalents, which latter he personally regarded as the least valuable, and, in fact, the least desirable part of the paper. They inevitably conveyed the impression that the author subscribed to the popular fallacy that valuation was

some mysterious process carried out by means of cabalistic formulæ ; whereas actually he was most careful to indicate throughout the whole of the rest of the paper how fully he was alive to the fact that careful consideration and the weighing of many variable factors was, or at least should be, the only basis of valuation.

The tables, when examined, proved to be nothing more than the two curves on the graph, written up large into four places of decimals. The author stated that there were many possible curves, and that the valuer who had a case of damage to rental on account of light must first decide upon the general shape of curve suitable for the case which he had in hand ; then he must choose the right curve, and, in the words of the paper, "the "curve must be selected with care so that the loss of value is a "fair one for all parts of the curve." He would then, presumably, compile a table of numerical equivalents to four places of decimals, after which he was free to start on his valuation.

Tables of numerical equivalents to a curve could, of course, be read off from squared paper, but four places of decimals meant an accuracy of 1 in 10,000, and that could only be attained by calculating from the mathematical formula to the curve. If, therefore, after a curve had been selected with that care which the author stated was essential, a matematical formula must then be found for it, one must be permitted to wonder when the valuation was likely to be completed, and to what astronomical limits Ryde's Scale must be expanded in order to represent adequate remuneration.

If the tables were as accurate as they purported to be, they involved a procedure which obviously was hopelessly impracticable. If they were not, they thereby tended to discredit and to weaken, if not indeed to contradict, the remainder of an otherwise excellent paper.

Fortunately, immediately after describing the amount of work which would be involved if one tried to make a valuation of injury to light, the author consoled one with a timely reminder of the truism that, after all, the duty of the valuer was not to calculate what the damage ought to be theoretically, but to estimate how much less rent would be paid for a room with a lesser penetration of good or adequate light by a reasonable member of the public, who, as was very rightly emphasised, did not use graphs or tables. Why, then, the four-figure tables?

Although the paper did not actually say so in as many words, it left no doubt, and in fact proved most conclusively, that, given proper data of the facts as to light, conveniently represented upon contour plans, every case of damage to market rental value by reason of loss of light was nothing more nor less than the

simple question of how much rental would a reasonable member of the public give for a room with less light ; and that that could only be answered by applying precisely the same methods which the experienced valuer applied to every other form of valuation, namely, the collation of all the relevant factors and the weighing of their respective materiality in order to arrive at a well-balanced considered opinion.

In the early days, twenty or thirty years ago, when little or nothing had been known about daylight, when there had been no instruments capable of measuring its variations, when the idiosyncrasies of the human eye had been unknown and unsuspected, when instruments had had to be invented, gadgets improvised, theory, measurements and measuring diagrams evolved, and even a standard of inadequacy discovered by patient research, the evolution of the present technique of measuring, predetermining and representing natural lighting had involved a certain amount of work and thought. But to-day, when everything had been reduced to such stark simplicity, it was difficult to understand the persistent refusal to allow the important and even vital subject of natural illumination to be included in the curricula of architectural schools.

Presumably one ought not to grumble, inasmuch as it allowed some surveyors to earn an honest penny, but it might make things difficult in the future—perhaps in the near future. Already everyone was calling out for more light, air and sun. In twenty years the nations of Europe had suddenly jumped back twenty centuries to the sun therapy of the ancient Greeks, so that to-day they were all sunbathers or nudists, and there was much talk of town planning their overbuilt towns.

In this country the legislature had changed the whips of disputes under their somewhat illogical ancient light law to the scorpions of appeals under the administration, sometimes extremely erratic, of the Town Planning Act, under which there could be no remedy of monetary damages but only injunction, and unless both architects and surveyors gave that subject more thought and consideration than they had done in the past there would be trouble.

There was one omission from the paper which, in his opinion, involved the risk of misunderstanding. He referred to the absence in the paper of any explanation that no fixed quantity of light was involved in the "grumble point" of light inadequate for ordinary purposes, 0·4 per cent. cill ratio or 0·2 per cent. daylight factor, which had been adopted by the Courts and standardised by no less than twenty-two countries in connection with town planning and building regulations. Those countries differed widely in latitude—sunny France and Spain and our Colonies had

accepted it as well as the countries of northern Europe, and this cloudy country where it had been first evolved.

It was still seldom realised, although it had been known for several years, that the eye was hopeless as an instrument for measuring daylight, although it could gauge intensities of artificial illumination with quite fair accuracy. The eye accepted with bovine indifference variations in daylight which were not only large but huge. Yet it could judge, and judge easily and correctly, over how much of any obstructed interior the light would be so inadequate that ordinary occupations, such as reading and writing, over long periods would entail eye strain and headache, and, strangely enough, so long as no direct sunlight was pentrating into the room, it would appraise the same disposition of adequate and inadequate light on, say, a wet day, when the inadequacy was represented by about 1 foot candle, and on bright days, when no part of the room might be less than 5, 10 or 15 foot candles—ample sufficiency under artificial light—and subsequent experience proved that the estimate was right.

The simple explanation was that in daylight the eye did not judge by amount at all, nor was it even much affected by amount. It judged and was affected by a subconscious appreciation of the difference between the outside and the inside light.

In much the same way that a boat drawing, say, 4 feet, will sail equally well over all depths and soundings until it runs aground on a shallow of 3 feet 11 inches, the eye functions comfortably and indifferently over great variations in the amount of daylight, except in positions which enjoy less than it needs, or rather less than that which it thinks it ought to have.

It seems to vary its minimum requirements with the weather, just as one can vary the draught of a boat with a variable centre-board. In any position, therefore, where it can be conscious of bright weather outside, it unconsciously closes its iris diaphragm and the remainder of its wonderful adjusting mechanism, so that its requirements in *quantum* of light increases.

Thus it was that when the " grumble point " of many people was ascertained by actual measurement some thirty years ago it proved to be a ratio of inside to outside light, and not a photometric quantity, as with artificial light. Fortunately it proved to be the same ratio for everybody, 0·4 per cent. cill ratio or 0·2 per cent. daylight factor. Thus it was that an interior position in London, so starved of light from visible sky that it had 1 foot candle or less on a wet day in winter, could remain inadequately lit, both apparently and actually, from dawn to sunset on a bright day in summer, and would be no less inadequately lit, both apparently and actually, if it were similarly obstructed in Italy or in India.

Mr. JOHN SWARBRICK, F.R.I.B.A. (Visitor) said he spoke with great diffidence, but as a member of the R.I.B.A. he wished to express his great appreciation of the valuable services which had been rendered by Mr. Head in solving a very difficult problem. He could, of course, only express his own personal opinion, as he had no authority to express any views on behalf of the Royal Institute of British Architects. He was conscious that Mr. Head had rendered a great service to everyone in the profession by analysing rent and the rental value of light in the way he had done. The method which Mr. Head had adopted had not been one which he himself had used in connection with making daylight plans, but the principle was the same. He himself had not used the phrase "numerical equivalents of light," but he had ascertained the rental value of areas, deprived of adequate light under the ultimate conditions, and then, by means of percentages, he had endeavoured to ascertain what was the light values (not the space values) of particular areas, and these had been capitalised in the usual way. He had frequently met Fellows of the Chartered Surveyors Institution who had prepared valuations in conjunction with him, and they had usually managed to agree substantially. His own work was done by a single operation. One speaker had already said that he believed that the work could be done by a single operation; and personally he thought that was quite possible. He quite agreed with what Mr. Waldram had said regarding the reduction factors. He considered that the calculation had been carried too far. It was not possible to deal with valuations in the simple way in which chemical problems could be dealt with. Light could not be regarded as if it were a gas, which would behave exactly in the same way, at all intensities. In fact, valuers were not really dealing with a problem of that nature at all; they were only considering the views of the average tenant in negotiation, and what the views of an average tenant were it was very difficult for anyone to determine. The views of different actual tenants varied considerably. One tenant had very little appreciation of light. That was especially noticeable in the case of shops, where some tenants would block out the light and cheerfully use artificial substitutes. Another tenant would value light and would reject rooms which had not an excess of daylight. There were those two extremes, and what valuers were trying to determine was the view of the average tenant, because it was the average tenant with whom they had to negotiate.

He did not wish to take up time with elementary points of that kind, but he did desire to express his entire agreement with the general principles. He had been very interested to notice one small point, and that was the reference to an allowance which was made in respect of loss of light by reflection from a

side wall. That was a matter which certainly could not be overlooked.

In conclusion he desired to express his own personal appreciation of the paper, which he thought was a very valuable one, and which should do much to bring about a better method of procedure.

Mr. S. Vvyvian Hicks (Fellow) said there was one point in connection with the matter which he would like to raise, and which he had raised on previous occasions; but before doing so he desired to add his quota of thanks to Mr. Head for his paper, which was an extremely interesting one. A previous speaker had said that the variation in settlement of terms in connection with light and air was no greater than in ordinary matters appertaining to purchase, and so on. Personally he did not agree with that. With regard to compulsory acquisition, and other compensation cases, the two parties knew that failure to agree meant arbitration and a setttement. Unfortunately, with regard to light and air, there was no such procedure. He had never been able to understand why legislation could not be introduced for the settlement of light and air disputes in a manner similar to the machinery for dealing with party-walls under the Building Act, namely, by the service of a notice and the preparation of an award. At the present time, however, the difficulty was that one could not compel the other side to get down to the essentials and discuss figures. They would sit on the hedge and say " This " is going to be most serious, and we shall go for an injunction," when in actual fact the damage might not be so very serious. He did urge that some steps might be taken to insist that machinery should be set up so that those matters could be settled without the threat of an injunction. In these days it was of course inappropriate to suggest additional legislation, but he thought that, when a building was going up, it was most unfair that the building owner might not know for months exactly how he could erect his building, and was not able to do anything definite until adjoining owners had condescended to discuss and settle terms.

Mr. Harold Head (Fellow) felt it a great honour to be allowed to be associated with the vote of thanks to Mr. Head—first of all because of his professional connection with Mr. Head, and also because he had been permitted by Mr. Head to take a certain part in the preparation of the paper.

One or two detailed points which he had been going to mention had been very adequately dealt with by previous speakers, so that he would confine his few remarks to certain aspects of

the inner history of the preparation of the paper. His cousin (the author) and himself had discussed the various aspects of the problem, starting very much from the first principles which Mr. Keen had so ably expressed, namely, that those things were, after all, a matter of opinion rather than a matter of calculation by any formulæ. The formulæ which had arisen from their study of the matter had been more or less arrived at in endeavouring to dissociate what they really had to value from what was not relevant to the situation at all. First of all, there was a large proportion of the rental value of a property which could not be affected one way or the other by loss of light; and although Mr. Keen had said that it was a matter of obvious logic to divide the rent or the value of a property into space-value and light-value, personally he had never seen it definitely stated before in so many words. Property obviously owed its value to the fact that there was space and that there was light present to enable that space to be used. Space was obviously not affected by the loss of light. Therefore if one could isolate from the total rent the rent due to light, one had at least got some distance in determining what had to be tackled. It had been forcibly brought home to him that that division was an important one when he had had occasion to inspect a hotel in the West Central part of London. That hotel was a very flourishing concern. Nevertheless, it had a dining-room which was practically unlighted. He was quite certain that if, in the original instance, that dining-room had been well lighted and an obstruction had come to the hotel and had so reduced the light of that dining room to its present meagre dimensions, the owner would have thought that he had a very good claim for compensation for loss of light; but the fact was that that hotel with a dark dining-room was a flourishing concern, and therefore the owner could not have lost very much. Why had not he lost very much? Because his space-rent proportion was so high compared with his light-rent proportion that the loss of light made practically no difference to the value of that room. Mr. Head's methods were somewhat on that line; he had endeavoured to identify, step by step, the points which governed the relevant factors in the case. He knew that not for a moment did Mr. Head pretend that his percentages were written as gospel truth. They were not. They were merely suggestions for the members to consider. Personally he did not see why anybody need object to a graph or at a list of four-figure tables not very difficult to understand. It seem to him that the author's curve No. 1 expressed fairly accurately the progressive damage likely to be suffered by a loss of light, because that particular curve had a rapid descent in its central portion, which was what Mr. Keen himself appeared to anticipate as appropriate.

Mr. RONALD COLLIER (Fellow) drew attention to two aspects of the matter. It seemed to him that there might be a time when people would go in the opposite direction to that which had been stressed that evening and not worry so much about daylight. Artificial light having so much improved, it might possibly come about that daylight in the future would be more and more dispensed with. There had been a time when people had said that they would not dispense with coal fires, but they had done so, and the same might apply to some extent with daylight—at least as far as commercial properties were concerned.

The second point which he would like to bring out and illustrate by a practical example was the manner in which a new erection might so enhance values in the neighbourhood as to offset, at least in part, the damage to a building's ancient lights. A building was being erected in the City costing £250,000. There had been a serious claim for ancient lights. The building which claimed had been valued at £25,000, and the depreciation value due to the new building had been estimated at between £3,000 and £5,000. The owners of the large new building had been prepared to buy the other building if necessary for £30,000, being £25,000 for value and £5,000 for loss of light. They had been fortunate in getting it for £24,000. His firm had sold it for £25,000 to a dealer who had said that the value of the erection of the new building, in such close proximity, so increased the value of the other as to offset the loss of light. That was a practical case, and undoubtedly there was something in it, although the Courts, of course, would not permit this to be offset.

The PRESIDENT, in putting the vote of thanks to the meeting, said that he desired to add his quota of thanks to Mr. Head for his most interesting paper.

He always thought that the greatest compliment which could be paid to a lecturer was the amount of discussion and interest which his paper evoked, and in this respect the enthusiastic discussion which had taken place that evening clearly reflected the success of Mr. Head's paper. He imagined that Mr. Head had written the paper anticipating a certain amount of discussion, and he did not think Mr. Head had been disappointed.

The vote of thanks was then put, and carried by acclamation.

The following written reply has been sent by Mr. G. LESLIE HEAD:—

The discussion on the paper had been very interesting from two points of view. Firstly, it has shown quite divergent opinions upon the figures which may be built into the suggested framework, and, secondly, because of the absence of that criticism which I had expected with regard to the framework itself.

In order to remove any misapprehension which might exist in the minds of my critics, I would reiterate once more that the paper was intended to show a method and not to lay down hard-and-fast figures. I have been careful everywhere to lay stress upon this fact, and the actual figures and schedules in the paper were intended to show how any value which might be appropriate could be utilised for the preparation of a valuation.

The chief criticisms of the method seemed to be directed at its complication, and several speakers emphasised this point. It must be remembered, however, that if an ordinary valuation of property were to be made without the use of the valuation tables it would be an even more complicated method than the one which I have outlined. The valuer, in the absence of tables, would have to pass through all the extended processes of preparing figures of years' purchase, involving different rates of interest and sinking fund, and his calculations and processes of thought would be extremely complicated. Ordinary valuations appear so frequently in the work of a surveyor that tables have been constructed which cut out for him a large measure of computation and enable calculations to be reduced into a small compass. Probably further development of light valuation will result in tables being constructed for the rate of decrease of value which will shorten the valuer's work in the same way as the ordinary valuation tables do.

Mr. Keen's chief criticism is directed to this very point. He suggests that the graph shown in the paper does not fairly represent his idea of the decrease in value as the light is gradually diminished. I do not suppose that it does, but between the upper and the lower points of the curve there are a variety of alternatives, one of which at least must fit in with Mr. Keen's ideas.

There is a distinction between the influence of a change of user on rental and its effect on capital value. A change of user need not necessarily imply a sharp drop in rent, although it might result in a sharp drop in capital value. This I have dealt with on page 314 of the paper.

Again, if reference be made to page 306 of the paper, it will

be seen that the change of user, or, as I have described it, "loss of market," is taken into account, and the curve is reversed at this point and thereafter flattens out.

Mr. Craig Hall made the interesting suggestion that rent might not be divisible and that it would be impossible to deduct space-rent from basic rent in order to obtain light-rent. In a measure Mr. Craig Hall's criticism is soundly based. It is, of course, impossible to obtain rent from light unless there is space attached. Light-rent is intangible and has no real existence unless it is allied to space-rent.

I do not agree, however, that space-rent is not capable of being isolated, for there are many rooms which receive only twilight illumination and which command a rent. Space-rent therefore is tangible. Standard rent is equally tangible. The difference between these two, although it cannot exist by itself as can space-rent, is a factor which can be used in making a calculation, even if it cannot exist by itself.

Mr. May's criticism that I have substituted three guesses for one guess is one which I anticipated and with which I had dealt in my synopsis, and I would repeat it here. It is my opinion that three simple guesses are likely to land nearer to the truth than one guess of a much more complicated nature.

Mr. Burnett made a very helpful suggestion, and one which, I think, should be incorporated in the method. I refer to his allusion to the size and proportion of the room when settling a figure of standard light. In the paper I have only taken into account competition and user. Size and proportion undoubtedly impart a fresh factor, which in some cases will have a bearing on the proper selection of a figure for standard light.

Mr. Waldram prefaced his comments with a regret that his previous paper had not been acknowledged. I should be very sorry if I had made such a grave omission. Fortunately, however, I find that I have not, and if Mr. Waldram will look at page 286 of the paper he will find that mention is made of this.

Mr. Waldram's next point is the apparent unnecessary accuracy in working out the tables from the graph to four places of decimals. He points out that it implies a degree of accuracy of one part in ten thousand, a figure far beyond the scope of any valuation.

I think that this criticism is not quite justified. These tables are multipliers, and are used as such in order to find a percentage of depreciation. To multiply a figure by ·5678 is equivalent to finding a figure of 56·78 per cent. Viewed from the percentage standpoint, the tables are only carried to two places of decimals. Now, Mr. Waldram is accustomed in his daylight plans to take percentages to one place of decimals, as is witnessed by his

·4 per cent. line. I have even heard Mr. Waldram express the opinion that, after making allowance for reflected light, the grumble point will not be ·4 per cent. but ·32 per cent., which I take to be in the same order of accuracy as the four-figure tables to which he takes exception.

Mr. Swarbrick made the point that any valuation of light must be made on the basis of the views of the average tenant. The average tenant is somewhat on a par with the reasonably minded man of whom we hear so much, and who does not exist as an individual but only in the mass. If the opinion of a large number of individuals were to be plotted upon the graph, it would be found that the resultant of all the opinions would be in the nature of a curve such as I have endeavoured to portray.

I would like to take this opportunity of recording in the *Transactions* my thanks to the President and members of the Chartered Surveyors' Institution for the pleasure which I feel at having been invited to read the paper, and for the interest which was displayed by the members in making some very helpful criticisms of its subject matter.

The following written communication has been received from Mr. W. A. LEACH (Professional Associate):—

My first criticism is in regard to the suggestion on page 293 that part of the adequately lighted area should be discounted where walls are not illuminated to a normal extent, the justification given for this being the added attractiveness of directly lighted walls. As is indicated at the top of page 291, wall lighting is an important practical factor, and not as dealt with on page 293 merely an æsthetic consideration, the reflection of light from wall surfaces improving the lighting standard of the whole room. It would therefore seem more logical to bring in some method of measuring the wall lighting in such a way that it can be added to the adequately lighted area. If a substantial proportion of the light entering the room falls upon wall surfaces, the room may be adequately lighted according to ordinary notions notwithstanding the position of the grumble-point line indicating inadequate lighting. The method of deduction cannot therefore bring out the real value of wall lighting.

On page 297 the question is raised as to whether on upper floors the figure of standard light should be higher than on lower floors. The answer lies in another question. "What is necessary "for the ordinary purposes of inhabitancy or business according "to ordinary notions?" As "special light" cannot be

considered, it does not seem to me that the particular floor level has any bearing on the matter.

We might, at this point, turn to the table on page 299 giving suggested figures for standard light, and consider this in conjunction with the case of *Fishenden* v. *Higgs & Hill*. In this case the suggestion was made that because a house was situated in Mayfair it could not expect to retain the same degree of light as a house in a more open area. In his judgment the Master of the Rolls said "That he found great difficulty in "applying the doctrine of locality with such particularity as that "suggested . . . . He preferred the evidence of plaintiff that "the diminution of light would render his premises less com-"fortable than before . . . . Plaintiff was entitled to have "consideration given to the type of house in which he lived "and that it was a residential district."

It would seem therefore that what people are prepared to accept in a particular district is not necessarily the measure of standard light. We are concerned with what is normal to a class of property irrespective of locality, and what is normal in the particular locality is only part of the evidence of normal requirements.

It might here be suggested that the rents of upper floors are maintained at the same standard as that of lower floors not by any additional light they may receive, but by the freedom of upper floors from the dust of the streets and the noise and smell of traffic. If this is true the hope expressed in paragraph 3, on page 298, is not likely to be realised.

As regards "standard rent" (page 299) I would offer the term "standard basic rent" as being clearer and in line with the table on page 301. It is, however, suggested that this analysis of rent into space-rent and light-rent is entirely unnecessary and wrong in principle. Space itself has no value; value lies in the attributes with which the space is endowed, *e.g.*, position, accessibility, character of development, and the attributes of adjacent spaces. Space is no more than the measure to which these combined attributes are or can be utilised, rent no more than the value of that combined utilisation. Withdraw or damage one attribute and the whole balance is upset, and a new valuation of the attributes is necessary. Thus, if a sixth-floor luxury flat is deprived of its lift service, its rental value might be depreciated by 90 per cent., but it would be wrong to allocate 90 per cent. of the rental value of the flat to the lift. Similarly, loss of quietude in a country house might result in a 50 per cent. loss of rent, but it would be wrong to allocate 50 per cent. of the rent as representing quietude. The loss is always a part of the original whole, and if quietude, light or any other attribute is

damaged, the injury is to the whole rent and not to an allocated part of the rent.

On page 301 we meet the proposition that every room has space rental value, which may be interpreted here as the rental value of space without light. The proper management of a building may, however, prevent the room which has had its light injured from being used for other purposes ; a room in a flat may become so much waste space. Similarly, an injury making rooms unsuitable for offices might prove more serious by reason of restrictive covenants or town planning regulations preventing the use of the rooms for other purposes. A useless odd dark room in a house or flat so far from having space-rent may actually depreciate the rental value of the entire holding. We are therefore again thrown back on an estimation of the value of the new balance of attributes of the premises after the light has been injured ; that it is the rental value as a whole which must be considered is clear when we come to " Consequential Damage " on page 315. The real meaning of the example in paragraph 2 of page 302 is that in the particular case stated the whole rental value of the room would be reduced by 60 per cent., and in the table on page 303, column 2, gives the maximum reduction which would occur in the whole rent if all light were withdrawn. Possibly that makes no difference to the subsequent procedure, but a scientific approach to a subject must be backed on accurate theoretical background.

The next step is the production of the graph. To do this we have first to estimate " adequate light," next the total loss of rental for total loss of light, and then draw a curve showing the estimated loss of rent at every intermediate stage in loss of light ; since every case must be judged on its own merits the estimates of adequate light, total loss of rent and intermediate values for the curve may well differ, and even in one building the loss of rent and the curve may differ from window to window. As in practice we are concerned only with two states (*a*) as existing, and (*b*) as will exist, it will probably seem simpler to the majority to limit speculation to these two states (the first of which will usually occasion no difficulty) rather than make a whole range of speculations. In any event it would probably be less than human if, in the production of the curve, the valuer did not make it fit his view of the loss applicable to the particular case. In making the direct estimate of the loss of rent the valuer uses his experience of the average man's reaction to a room the light of which is normal, darkish, dark, or very dark ; he would have to do the same in drawing the curve so that the curve is no more reliable than the direct estimate ; but by enabling himself by the use of the curve to establish proportionate losses of rent for every stage of loss of

light he would have refinements which would often lead him to over-rate or under-rate the real effect of the damage, and increase the scope for differences with the value on the opposite side.

The use of the tables also involves the valuer in this difficulty, that, having endeavoured to justify as scientific deduction what is, after all, no more than his personal opinion, and having arrived, as in Example 1 on page 312, at a precise figure of £6 15*s.*, he cannot, without seeming to discard his science, set aside that precise figure and call the answer £5 or £10, one or other of which is more likely to be the actual loss. The normal tenant's mind does not run to rents of £93 15*s.*, and £90 or £95 is more likely to be the new letting rental.

In Example II. we have a further complication. In addition to estimating the result of total loss of light we have to estimate the result of improved lighting giving further scope for divergence of views.

Example III. introduces another difficulty—"outlook." Whichever way we approach the problem the value of this has to be determined as it cannot form part of the claim for loss. When, however, the room is deprived of its outlook, its appeal is different and the effect of loss of light may be more or less than if the outlook could be retained. If its new appeal is to a less exacting type of tenant, the curve drawn for the room as originally existing will be inapplicable. This gives scope for two further personal estimates, and it does seem that the refinement of the table of factors on top of these estimates is rather like trying to measure a room by estimating the feet and scaling off the inches.

The case considered on page 315 is to my mind a case where the system advocated by the author is quite inapplicable. What we are there concerned with is the injury to a suite of rooms ordinarily let as a suite.

Method 1 is wrong because to ascertain the injury to light in the particular room or rooms directly affected and then to add something for injurious affection of the remained is dividing an indivisible damage. The something added must obviously be the amount required to make up the directly estimated injury to the rent of the suite as a whole.

Method 2 would not necessarily give an accurate result. The injury to the suite as a whole is not limited to the injury to the higher priced individual room.

Method 3 fails for the same reason, whilst the variation of lighting standard adopted for each room gives additional scope for differences of opinion.

I can readily imagine that the curves themselves would be a fruitful source of dispute. The market determines these curves,

i.e., the man in the street, and if his perceptions differentiate only light, darkish, dark and very dark, then our curves must show the same steps. I should not agree that a loss of light to a darkish room would be more damaging than an equal or proportionate loss to a light room. My own ideas of the general trend of curves are:—

(*a*) That on either side of the points representing the average tenant's views of a light, darkish, dark and very dark room (assuming such points could be determined with sufficient accuracy) the curve would flatten and so become a series of steps. His perceptions are not sufficiently acute to note minor shades of difference, and slight variations of light, perceptible at most only to a sitting tenant, would have little effect on market rental value.

(*b*) That the sharpest decline in the curve would be between the flattened sections representing the light room and the darkish room, and a little less sharp between darkish and dark. The perfect article is more affected by damage than the slightly imperfect. The reason for this is that the damaged article is subject to a double-action force of depreciation: (1) a person naturally expects to pay less for the imperfect article, whilst at the same time (2) fewer people are in the market for it, and the active demand is lessened ; the market for the damaged article is however less fastidious, and with the cream taken from the market the subsequent thinning of demand becomes more gradual. Thus the fall in value tends to become less pronounced as injury increases.

If we are unable to estimate the damage directly with any reasonable degree of accuracy I cannot see that the enlargement of the field of speculation will produce any more accurate result, and if we can estimate the damage directly with reasonable accuracy, the method advocated would only seem to give scope for reduced accuracy and lessen the chances of agreement.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING,

Monday, 31st May, 1937.

The Report of the Scrutineers of the Ballot for the Election of the Council was read to the Meeting.

The Report declared that the following were duly elected a

COUNCIL FOR THE ENSUING YEAR.

Fellows.

JAMES BARR
SIR CHARLES BRESSEY, C.B.
C. CHART
W. H. CHRISTY CLAY, O.B.E.
H. F. COBB, C.B.E.
R. COBB
COLONEL H. C. COLE, C.B.E.
J. D. DREW
W. H. EVE
T. P. FRANK
H. FRANKS
G. GARDNER
A. NORMAN GARRARD
SIR CHARLES GOTT
J. HERBERT HALL
DRYLAND HASLAM
OSWALD HEALING
ROBERT HENDRY
S. A. KELLY
H. J. KING
CUTHBERT LAKE
H. W. LANGDON
G. A. LANSDOWN
J. A. McAULEY
L. O. MATHEWS
A. W. MERRY
J. O. NESBITT
FRANCIS PETER
H. I. RICHMOND
A. L. SCOTT
JOHN SCOTT
H. E. SHERWIN
EDWARD J. SILCOCK
A. L. THOMAS, M.B.E.
G. L. VIGERS

Professional Associates.

O. F. COOKE-YARBOROUGH
H. B. EVE
A. J. MILLER
F. J. TRUMPER

Associates.

COLONEL THE RT. HONBLE. SIR GEORGE L. COURTHOPE, BT., M.C., M.P.
SIR HARRY COURTHOPE-MUNROE, K.C.

The Report of the Council on the affairs of the Institution and the Statement of Receipts and Expenditure for the year 1936 were read.

IT WAS RESOLVED—"That the Report of the Council and the Balance Sheet be received and approved, and be printed and circulated with the *Transactions*."

IT WAS RESOLVED—"That the thanks of the Institution are due and be given to the PRESIDENT, VICE-PRESIDENTS, HONORARY SECRETARY, and the other MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES OF THE COUNCIL, for the able manner in which they have administered the affairs of the Institution."

IT WAS RESOLVED—"That the thanks of the Institution be given to Messrs. A. S. BENNION and E. J. POULTON for the efficient performance of their duties as Auditors, and that they be requested to continue their services for the coming year; and to Messrs. H. S. G. BEDELLS, WILLIAM BELL, R. S. BEVAN, W. T. BISHOP, G. D. BLAKE, C. BURKETT, C. S. BURKETT SMITH, H. G. BUSS, E. R. CANHAM, G. E. DUNNAGE, A. S. FORD, E. B. GILLETT, A. GIMSON, H. A. GLOVER, H. B. HALE, A. R. C. HALL, E. A. MALBY, D. G. MOTION, E. PAYNTER, K. H. READ, D. SOMERS, K. B. STANLEY and G. W. TOLLETT for their services as Scrutineers."

The CHAIRMAN presented the following Prizes won by Candidates in the Preliminary and Professional Examinations, 1937:—

THE "PENFOLD" SILVER MEDAL

for the highest percentage (over 75% of the maximum) in Parts I. and II. of the Intermediate Examination to ALFRED JOHN PARFITT.

THE "HYMAN MARKS" PRIZE

for the highest percentage of marks in Part I. of the Intermediate Examination to JOHN HOWARTH ROWLANDSON.

THE "SPECIAL" PRIZE OF THE VALUE OF £10 10*s.*

to ERNEST BRANDON for the highest percentage of marks in Part II. of the Intermediate Examination.

THE "PENFOLD" GOLD MEDAL

for the highest marks (over 75% of the maximum) in the Final Examination to MAURICE ALFRED CLIVE HERSCHEL HARDCASTLE.

Mr. HARDCASTLE was also the winner of—

THE "DRIVER" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £500,

awarded to the Candidate who obtains the highest percentage in the Final Examination ;

and of—

THE "WAINWRIGHT" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £500,

awarded to the Candidate in the Final Examination who is found to have obtained the highest percentage of marks in the Intermediate and Final Examinations combined.

"THE INSTITUTION" PRIZE OF THE VALUE OF £15 15*s.*

awarded to the second Candidate in the Final Examination to GEORGE MCDONALD MUNRO SAVAGE.

Mr. SAVAGE was also the winner of—

THE "JOHN GILCHRIST" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £100,

awarded to the Candidate who obtained the highest percentage of marks in the Scottish Final Examination.

THE "GALSWORTHY" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £500,

awarded to the Candidate in the Final Examination who is found to have obtained the second highest percentage of marks in the Intermediate and Final Examinations combined to BERTRAM MORLEY WALLER.

THE "BEADEL" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £200,

for the best work in the subject of "Agriculture," to RONALD MACKAY SMITH, who obtained 84% of the maximum marks.

THE "MELLERSH" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £100,

for the best work in "Outdoor Forestry, Timber Valuing "and Measuring" to HARRY VICTOR BROWN, who obtained 80% of the maximum marks.

THE "CRAWTER" PRIZE,

Being the Interest accruing on a Sum of £200,

for the best work in "Principles of Valuation" to THOMAS DOW, who obtained 86% of the maximum marks.

THE "QUANTITIES" PRIZE OF THE VALUE OF £5 5*s*.

to ALBERT DOUGLAS MASON, who obtained 77% of the maximum marks.

THE "CONSTRUCTIVE AND WORKING DRAWINGS" PRIZE OF THE VALUE OF £5 5*s*.

to COLIN BROWN, who obtained 87% of the maximum marks in the subject.

THE "SCOTTISH" PRIZE

awarded to the Candidate from Scotland who obtained the highest percentage of marks in Parts I. and II. of the Intermediate Examination to ROBERT MARSHALL HAMILTON.

THE "JULIAN ROGERS" SCHOLARSHIP

awarded to the Candidate at the head of the list in the Preliminary Examination, to JAMES NISBET.

THE SIXTY-NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

Session 1936-1937.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

***Monday*, 31*st May*, 1937.**

In this Report for the Session 1936-1937, presented at a time of national festivity associated with the recent Coronation of Their Majesties King George the Sixth and Queen Elizabeth, the Council are pleased to announce that the King has graciously consented to accept the office of Patron of the Institution. In token of their devotion and loyalty a Loyal Address was presented on behalf of the members of the Institution to His Majesty on the occasion of his Coronation.

A notable event of the session was the Annual Dinner held at Grosvenor House on the 2nd March, 1937. The attendance of 536 persons was a record, and the occasion was chosen by the Minister of Transport (the Rt. Hon. Leslie Hore-Belisha, M.P.) for his announcement, which aroused so much controversy both in Parliament and in the Press, concerning the parking of cars in streets.

The Annual Ball, which was held as an Institution function for the first time, took place at Grosvenor House on the 12th January, 1937. The experiment was fully justified by the large attendance of members and their guests and by the record sum of £118 7*s.* 7*d.* realised for the Benevolent Fund, in aid of which the Ball was held. The arrangements

for the Ball were largely undertaken by Mr. F. J. Trumper, assisted by the President and a special sub-committee of the Junior Organisation, to whom the sincere thanks of the Council are due for the success achieved.

Members will join with the Council in deploring the death at the early age of forty-seven of Mr. Charles Allen Bennett, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Institution. Mr. Bennett, who had been on the staff of the Institution for twenty-seven years, was a man of sound judgment, a courteous manner and an ever-willing disposition to do his duty by those whom he was called upon to serve. His work for the Institution, especially, perhaps, as the officer responsible for the examinations and the work in connection with the Benevolent Fund, will not easily be forgotten.

In December of last year Mr. Charles Gregor Simpson, M.A., LL.B., was appointed as an Assistant Secretary of the Institution.

The Institution has again been honoured by the Lord Mayor of London, who appointed the President as an additional member of the Committee selected to consider and advise upon the erection of a statue to His late Majesty King George the Fifth. Sir John Oakley, G.B.E., and Mr. H. M. Stanley (Past-Presidents) are already members of this Committee, as mentioned in last year's Report.

The retiring Members of Council at the end of last session were Messrs. T. Peirson Frank, J. E. Drower, C.B.E., and G. J. N. de St. Croix (Fellows). The sincere thanks of the Institution are due to them for their services rendered during their years of office.

The new Members of Council who took office at the beginning of the year under review were Messrs. Frank Hunt, C.V.O., H. W. Langdon, A. L. Thomas, M.B.E. (Fellows), and Mr. H. Brian Eve (Professional Associate).

Membership.

The comparative tables showing the statistics of membership are given on page 350.

Table A.

	Honorary Members.	Fellows.	Colonial Fellows.	Professional Associates.	Associates.	Probationers.	Students.	Total.
May, 1936 ...	35	2864	127	3832	33	1400	317	8608
„ 1937 ...	36	2897	122	3928	34	1290	308	8615
	+1	+33	−5	+96	+1	−110	−9	+7

Table A (1).

Holders of Women House Property Managers' Certificates:—

May, 1936	24
May, 1937	45

Table B.

	Members (or "Fellows" after 1881).	Associates.		Probationers.	Students.	Total.
		Professional.	Ordinary.			
May, 1869	162	38			2	202
„ 1870	180	59			2	241
„ 1880	342	155			10	507
„ 1890	1095	310	89		123	1617
„ 1900	1883	757	88		336	3064
„ 1910	1862	1970	75		365	4272
„ 1920	2191	2510	47	36	132	4916
„ 1930	2675	3094	35	928	436	7168
„ 1931	2720	3198	34	1130	346	7428
„ 1932	2748	3350	37	955	533	7623
„ 1933	2777	3448	35	1064	715	8039
„ 1934	2794	3515	34	1306	511	8160
„ 1935	2854	3649	33	1308	412	8256
„ 1936	2864	3832	33	1400	317	8446
„ 1937	2897	3928	34	1290	308	8457

Honorary Members	36
Colonial Fellows	122
Women House Property Managers ...	45
1937 Grand Total ...	8660

In 1883 "Associates" were divided into "Ordinary" and "Professional" Associates.

Sir Maurice Gwyer, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., K.C., was elected an honorary member during the year, on his appointment as the first Chief Justice of India.

The death of the following members of long standing must be recorded with regret:—

Mr. Robert Rich, Didcot (1876) ; Mr. T. Colgate, Newhaven (1882) ; Mr. P. H. Clarke, London (1883); Mr. R. T. G. Abbott, Malton (1884) ; Mr. C. W. Willoughby, Merstham (1884) ; Mr. Frank Massie, Wakefield (1885) ; Sir H. Trustram Eve, K.B.E., Bedford (1887) ; Mr. W. J. Samuel, Milford-on-Sea (1887) ; Mr. E. J. Belcher, Wantage (1889) ; Mr. W. H. Cross, Manchester (1890) ; Mr. F. A. Powell, London (1890) ; Mr. C. V. Stevens, London (1890) ; Mr. E. S. Cox, York (1890) (President, 1927-28) ; Mr. H. A. Rawlins, London (1890) ; Mr. H. S. Batey, Manchester (1891) ; Mr. J. Elford, Poole (1891) ; Mr. H. J. Leaning, London (1891) ; Mr. A. E. Ellis, Exeter (1892) ; Mr. J. H. Wilson, London (1892) ; Mr. P. W. Gray, Cambridge (1893) ; Mr. A. E. Butler, Wokingham (1894) ; Mr. D. Dinwiddy, London (1894) ; Mr. W. Jarmain, London (1894) ; Mr. W. H. Read, London (1894) ; Mr. G. H. A. Connor, East Lothian (1897) ; Mr. T. W. A. Hayward, St. Leonards-on-Sea (1897) ; Mr. R. J. Jenkins, Southsea (1897) ; Mr. F. S. Sutton, London (1898) ; Mr. H. E. Allpress, London (1898) ; Mr. A. K. Burtenshaw, Hailsham (1898) ; Mr. J. C. L. Bettridge, Birmingham (1898) ; Mr. G. W. Hunt, Eardisley (1899) ; Mr. A. L. Rutter, Cambridge (1899) ; Mr. R. H. Chichester, Lincoln (1899) ; Mr. J. P. Martin, Seaford (1900) ; Mr. A. G. Cross, London (1903) ; Mr. H. R. Guinness, Dublin (1904) ; Mr. E. Watson, London (1904) ; Mr. A. M. Kisch, London (1909) ; Mr. C. Y. E. de la Quintana, London (1912) ; Sir Francis D. W. Drummond, Carmarthen (1916).

Obituary notices of these and other members have appeared in the *Journal* during the year.

Professional Practice.

Mention was made in last year's Report of the Conference arranged with the Law Society with the object of obtaining reciprocity from the legal profession for By-Law 24 (3) which forbids members of the Institution from engaging in work recognised as being properly that of a solicitor. A report having been received from the Law Society which showed a sympathetic attitude to the Institution's views, conversations were resumed to discuss further points arising out of that report, and a drafting committee, equally representative of each side of the Conference, has been formed to prepare for publication a joint memorandum, setting out the considered views of the parties on the various matters that have been for the past two years the subject of discussion between them.

With a view to enhancing the reputation of the profession in the eyes of the public, a conference was arranged with the Newspaper Society in the hope of securing that newspaper advertisements emanating from estate agents should not contain terms incompatible with the best professional ethics.

The Appointments Register.

During the past year 192 vacancies have been notified to the Register.

Many of the appointments were of a temporary nature, but there has been an advance in the number of employers requiring permanent assistants. The demand for architectural and quantity surveyor assistants has exceeded the supply, and there has also been an expansion in the number of requests for valuation assistants.

Analysis of the appointments secured through the instrumentality of the Register discloses the following:—

Land Agency	20
Valuation	45
Building	29
Quantities	11

It is satisfactory that during the year only a very small number of members have been registered as not employed. There is evidence of an increasing demand for appointments with security of tenure and superannuation, but since most of the Central and Local Government appointments offered have not been permanent in character, there have not been the same facilities as in the past for placing members in those Services.

In addition to submitting members' names to prospective employers, over 250 notices of appointments covering all branches of the profession have been circulated to the members on the Register. Enquiries numbering 224 have been dealt with relating to articled pupils, and the panel of members prepared to take pupils now totals 166.

Introductions for professional work still continue to be given to members of the public, insurance companies, solicitors, banks, building societies, &c., and 237 recommendations for such work have been made during the year under review.

Arbitrations.

The practice of requesting the President to appoint an arbitrator for the settlement of technical disputes continues. In addition to a number of requests from private sources, applications were received in several instances from public authorities including Government Departments.

The President himself, at the joint request of the members concerned, and on a submission in each case of an agreed statement of the facts, has adjudicated in several disputes as to the sharing of commissions.

The Examinations.

Table C shows the total number of entries for the 1937 examinations as compared with previous years, and the number of passes. Table D shows the results, in analytical form, achieved by candidates in England and Wales. In

addition, 207 candidates were re-examined in their Typical Subject. Of these 116 were successful.

There were 114 Scottish candidates, of whom 41 entered for Part I., 1 for Parts I. and II., and 36 for Part II. of the Intermediate, 30 for the Final and Special Degree Holders, and 6 for Typical Subjects. Of these 16 passed Part I., and 28 Part II. of the Intermediate, 28 the Final and Special Degree Holders, while 1 was referred back in the Typical Subject.

The Irish candidates numbered 31, of whom 6 passed Part I. and 4 Part II. of the Intermediate, 3 the Final, 1 the Direct Fellowship, and 4 were referred back in their Typical Subjects.

Of the 25 candidates who sat for the examinations overseas, 8 passed Part I. and 3 Part II. of the Intermediate, and 1 the Final.

TABLE C.

Years.	Preliminary Examinations.			Professional Examinations.		
	Candidates.	Passed.	Percentage.	Candidates.	Passed.	Percentage
1881	13	6	46·15	2	1	50·00
1890	53	44	83·01	96	70	72·91
1900	131	102	77·86	325	193	59·38
1910	130	95	73·08	623	437	70·14
1920	70	55	78·57	487	322	62·12
1930	563	350	62·17	993	595	59·92
1931	580	352	60·69	1,127	688	61·04

Year.	Preliminary Examination.		Intermediate Examination.			Final, Direct Fellowship and Special Degree Examinations.	
	Candidates.	Passed.	Candidates.	Passed.		Candidates.	Passed.
				Part I.	Part II.		
1932	519	299	898	586	219	482	256
1933	453	250	1,169	369	364	506	217
1934	343	134	1,275	469	352	517	297
1935	300	167	1,206	459	333	553	267
1936	316	172	1,252	407	378	569	270
1937	343	177	1,380	348	344	614	273

For the Women's House Property Management Certificate Examination 25 candidates presented themselves, and 14 were successful.

In future the two parts of the Intermediate Examination will be treated as separate examinations, so that no candidate will be permitted to sit for Part II. until he has secured a pass in Part I.

TABLE D.—*England and Wales.*

—	Sub-Division I. Land Agency.			Sub-Division II. Valuation.			Sub-Division III. Building and Quantities.			Sub-Division IV. Mining.			Percentage of Candidates who passed.
	Examined.	Passed.	Referred back in Typical Subject.	Examined.	Passed.	Referred back in Typical Subject.	Examined.	Passed.	Referred back in Typical Subject.	Examined.	Passed.	Referred back in Typical Subject.	
Intermediate Part I.— Non-Students	Examined, 829; Passed, 318;												38·36
Intermediate Part II.—													
Students	1	—	—	3	1	1	9	5	1	—	—	—	46·15
Non-Students	52	32	8	270	143	13	197	77	35	1	1	—	48·65
Final	13	5	3	244	67	70	179	90	10	4	4	—	39·52
Direct Fellowship	4	2	1	6	—	—	1	—	—	2	1	1	23·07
Special Examination	4	3	1	2	1	1	5	1	2	—	—	—	45·45

The Special Diploma Examinations.

The examinations for the Special Diplomas in Rating and Town Planning were held in June, 1936.

Twelve candidates sat for the Rating Examination, and the following seven were successful:—Messrs. G. Burkmar (Chingford), D. J. Cockram (Taunton), R. A. Eeles (London), L. C. Harris (Kingston-upon-Thames), A. A. V. Hoddy (London), D. F. Mills (Taunton), R. Parry (London).

In the Town Planning Examination Messrs. G. R. Thomas (Nairobi) and R. L. Wright (Reading), who were the only candidates, were both successful.

The Scholarships.

A University Scholarship of £100 per annum, tenable at Cambridge for two years from October, 1937, has been awarded to Mr. C. A. Lock, of Caterham School, and a Post-Graduate Scholarship of £125 has been awarded to Miss Alma Royalton Kisch tenable at Cambridge for one year.

The reports received from the Cambridge authorities upon the work of the Institution scholars now at the University continue to be satisfactory.

With a view to extending the Institution Scholarships' scheme, the Council have decided to award as an experiment two new Scholarships for a course of study at the College of Estate Management for the Degree of B.Sc. Estate Management (London).

Each Scholarship will be of a value equal to one-half of the cost of the course of preparation subject to a maximum of £50. It is not proposed that these Scholarships should be definitely incorporated in the existing Scholarships scheme until experiment has shown that their continuance would be justified.

The Standing and Special Committees.

Eleven meetings of the Council and 115 meetings of the Standing, Special Committees and their Sub-committees have been held during the year under review.

The following Parliamentary Bills, or portions of them, have been examined by the Parliamentary Committee:—

The Architects' Registration Bill ;
The Factories Bill ;
The Canvey Island U.D.C. Bill ;
The Poole Corporation Bill ;
The Rotherham Corporation Bill ;
The Barnet District Gas and Water Bill ;
The Staffordshire County Council Bill ;
The Hertfordshire County Council (Colne Valley Sewage, &c.) Bill ;
The Bath Corporation Bill ;
The Arbitration Bill ;
The Livestock Industry Bill.

Representations were made to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Transport urging that legislation should be introduced at the next suitable opportunity to require that notices as to the date, place and subject matter of public local enquiries should be published in the press. Although it is understood that it is customary for the Government department to request local authorities to publish notices of public local enquiries, there is at present no obligation upon the local authorities to do so.

Reference was made in last year's Annual Report to the Government's intention to transfer the ownership of mineral royalties to the State, and the steps taken by the Mining Committee to protect those surveyors whose livelihood would be affected by such transfer. The Mining Committee have continued to devote close attention to this matter. Their deputation to the Mines Department on the 24th April, 1936, was followed by another on the 6th January, 1937, at which the Secretary for Mines himself announced the official attitude against compensation to the mineral surveyor. At this meeting the Institution was invited to appoint a small committee for the purpose of consulting with the officers of the Mines Department on such legislative provisions as might affect mine surveyors and mineral agents, the right, however, being reserved to the Institution to take such steps as might seem proper to protect the mine surveyor and mineral agent when the contents

of the Bill became known. This special committee has been constituted and has commenced conversations with the Mines Department.

A Bill introduced by Lord Askwith in the House of Lords to prevent parties to contracts or their officers, servants or agents from acting as sole umpires or arbitrators for the determination of matters which, by the contract, were referable to arbitration in cases of dispute, received the complete support of the Institution. An article on this Bill appeared in the *Journal* for January, 1937.

The Livestock Industry Bill, which contains the proposals of the Government for the rationalisation of the livestock industry by the Government in certain areas, may seriously affect members of the profession engaged in business as livestock auctioneers, and it has been thoroughly examined by the Livestock (Emergency) Committee—a body which was appointed four years ago to watch this class of legislation, and consists of leading livestock auctioneers, including representatives of the Institution.

A memorandum was presented to the Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Health on Building By-laws, embodying the views of the Institution as to the amendment of the Model Building By-laws issued by the Ministry for the guidance of local authorities outside London. The memorandum appeared in the *Journal* for February, 1937, and was amplified by representatives of the Institution who subsequently attended at the Ministry of Health.

The Draft Building By-laws issued by the London County Council under the London Building Amendment Act, 1935, were submitted to the Institution pursuant to that Act. The objections and observations of the Institution were submitted through a Joint Committee of the Institution, the Institution of Civil Engineers, the Institution of Structural Engineers and the Royal Institute of British Architects to the Ministry of Health. Subsequently representatives of the four bodies attended a conference with the London County Council, with the result that the Draft Building By-laws were substantially amended.

Similar action was taken with similar results upon the Draft By-laws proposed by the London County Council under the same Act for the use of timber in the construction and conversion of buildings.

The decision of the Joint Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons to consider the provisions of the Romford U.D.C. Act, 1931, with respect to the provisions to be inserted in future legislation as to contributions by frontagers towards the expense of the construction of public sewers, showed that the Institution had contributed to a useful piece of work in securing that frontagers' contributions should be assessed on an equitable basis and that the statutory provisions relating thereto should be drafted in reasonably intelligent terms.

A Special (London Town Planning) Committee was constituted to report to the Council on questions of general principle affecting the planning of built areas as illustrated by the tentative planning proposals for London.

As a result of the report and recommendations of that Committee a memorandum of observations of doubt or difficulty arising from these proposals has been submitted for the consideration of the London County Council, with a request that a deputation be received to discuss its contents.

Mention was made in the last Annual Report of a Special Committee which had been set up by the Council to consider whether and how far the Institution could extend its usefulness under present conditions in matters specially connected with land surveying. This Committee have now completed a lengthy investigation into the subjects referred to them. On their recommendation the Council have appointed a Standing Committee of Land Surveyors for the purpose of advising how best the work and status of the land surveying branch of the profession can be advanced, and a closer co-ordination achieved with the other interests served by the Institution. This Committee will begin its work at the commencement of the Session 1937-1938.

The other recommendations made by this Committee and

adopted by the Council were published in full in the *Journal* for May, 1937.

The last Annual Report referred to the representations made to the Minister of Agriculture by the Institution and the kindred societies for the protection of tithe collectors, who would be affected by the Tithe Act, 1936. The Government declined to grant compensation to collectors for loss of office, but invited the appointment of a committee representative of the bodies concerned to consult and negotiate with the Tithe Redemption Commission on matters likely to affect the interests of collectors during the lifetime of the Commission.

Following upon this, the Professional (Tithe) Committee was constituted from representatives of the Institution and the kindred societies, with headquarters at 12, Great George Street, Mr. J. E. Bidwell (Past-President) as Chairman, Mr. R. W. Trumper (Fellow) as Hon. Secretary, and the Secretary of the Institution as Secretary of the Committee. A full report of the work accomplished by this Committee in its early days was given in the Report of the Annual Agricultural Conference published in the *Journal* for February, 1937. The Committee will continue in being, in order to place their services at the disposal of collectors confronted with difficulties arising out of the new system of collection introduced by the Tithe Redemption Commission as from 1st April, 1937.

The sincere thanks of the Institution are cordially extended to Mr. R. W. Trumper, not only for the onerous duties he has performed as Hon. Secretary of the Committee, but also for his services so readily given in advising and helping collectors generally on the numerous and considerable difficulties which have arisen since the passage of the Act.

For some considerable time the Council have been engaged in negotiations with His Majesty's Office of Works with the object of securing an upward revision of the scale of fees authorised for the remuneration of quantity surveyors on the panel of that department. The Council are

able to report that their efforts have resulted in a new scale of fees and conditions of employment, approved by the Office of Works and the Treasury, which is considered satisfactory when compared with the scale previously in force. The new scale has been adopted by the other Government departments responsible for the employment of quantity surveyors. The thanks of the Council are specially due to Mr. Oswald Healing (Member of Council) and his Sub-Committee for their services in bringing the protracted negotiations to a successful conclusion.

Similar negotiations with the London County Council have resulted in an agreement which represents a substantial improvement in the scale of fees formerly authorised by the Council for quantity surveying services.

Five meetings were held by the Rating Diploma Holders Section (which consists of the seventy-three members who hold the Special Diploma in Rating of the Institution) during the period under review. At the first meeting on the 14th May, 1936, " The valuation of public utility undertakings " was discussed. At the meeting on the 16th July, 1936, Mr. A. H. London (Fellow) introduced for discussion, by means of a paper, " The assessment of tenement " houses," and at the Annual Meeting held on the 22nd October, 1936, Mr. H. S. Logsdon (Professional Associate) opened the discussion on the question of allowing a renewal fund in a gas company's valuation, and " The " method of treating the cost of repairs, now thrown " upon the tenant by the 1925 Act in the case of a " gas company, when estimating the tenant's capital." " Some rating exemptions " was the subject of a discussion which was opened by Mr. A. Lockwood (Fellow) at the meeting on the 21st January, 1937, and at the last meeting on the 1st April, 1937, Mr. Herbert Coley (Professional Associate) introduced for discussion the subject " Industrial hereditaments."

The Chairman and Honorary Secretary of the Section, respectively, were Mr. E. E. Lambert (Fellow) and Mr. George V. Nye (Fellow). On behalf of the Section they

desire to express in the warmest terms the pleasure felt by their brother-members at the presence of the President at so many of their meetings.

Royal Commissions and Parliamentary and Departmental Committees.

Water Resources and Supplies.

Reference was made in the last Annual Report to a Memorandum submitted by the Institution to the Joint Committee of the House of Lords and the House of Commons on the proposals which were under their consideration for new legislation on the question of the country's water resources and supplies. Mr. E. J. Silcock (Vice-President) and Sir Charles Gott (Member of Council) attended before the Joint Committee as witnesses for the Institution on 26th May, 1936.

When the Report of the Joint Committee was issued it was seen that their views seemed largely to coincide with those put forward by the Institution in criticism of the suggested proposals. Extracts from the Report were published in the September *Journal,* forming an interesting comparison with the Institution's views given in the *Journal* for December, 1935.

Royal Commission on Safety in Coal Mines.

In the Report for last Session reference was made to the *Joint Report on Standards of Accuracy and Limits of Error for Plans and Surveys of Mines,* published jointly by the Institution and the Institute of Mine Surveyors and forwarded to the Mines Department.

This year the Institute of Mine Surveyors decided to use the joint report as the basis of their evidence to the Royal Commission on Safety in Coal Mines. The evidence of the Institute was supported by the Institution in a memorandum submitted to the Commission in April of this year and reproduced in the *Journal* for May.

The County Branches.

The President established a record for recent years by visiting all the County Branches at least once during his term of office, and was thus afforded an excellent opportunity of seeing the work of the Branches at first hand and of meeting many members throughout the whole of the British Isles.

On all of these visits the President was able personally to gain an insight into what may be described as the local government of the Institution, an aspect which is essential to the true welfare of any professional society and which has helped so materially in the healthy development of the Institution since the system was inaugurated some seventeen years ago. Once again the Council desire to place on record their gratitude to the honorary secretaries of Branches, whose unsparing work for their members on the one hand and for the Council on the other is deserving of the highest praise.

The formation of agricultural sub-committees in the various Branches is a development from which the Council feel that much good will be forthcoming to the major industry of the country. Among the important matters referred during the session to the County Branches by the Council for comment and advice was the memorandum on " Grass drying " prepared by the Gloucester, Somerset and North Wilts Branch. Although the subject is still in the experimental stage, it was evident from the replies received that the Council were justified in looking to the County Branches for advice and guidance upon it.

Among the subjects on which papers were read and discussed at Branch meetings during the year were the following:—

The Restriction of Ribbon Development Act, 1935 ;
Notes on the management and maintenance of corporation housing estates ;
Modern methods of building construction ;
The duties of a rating surveyor ;

The Tithe Act, 1936 ;
Private treaty sales ;
The characteristics and uses of reinforced concrete in building work ;
Air surveying ;
Forestry ;
The practice of the quantity surveyor ;
Real estate as an investment ;
Trading estates ;
Management of residential flats ;
Acclimatisation in sheep stock valuations ;
Land drainage and the Land Drainage Act, 1930.

The International Federation of Surveyors.

At the Annual Meeting of the Permanent Committee of the International Federation of Surveyors held in Belgrade in September, 1936, the Institution was represented by Colonel H. C. Cole, C.B.E. (Vice-President) (President of the Federation), Sir Charles Gott (Member of Council) (Vice-President of the Federation), and the Secretary in his capacity as Secretary-General of the Federation.

A Report of the proceedings of the meeting, given to the Council at their November meeting, referred especially to the valuable work of the Committees on Cadastral Surveying and on the preparation of an International Dictionary of Technical Terms in English, French and German ; and to the courtesy and hospitality which had been offered by the Government and the Association of Surveyors of Jugoslavia to the delegates of the eight federated nations who had been represented at the meeting.

Agriculture and Agricultural Matters.

The Sixth Annual Conference of Agricultural Members arranged by the Agricultural Committee was held at the Institution on the 12th January, and was well attended by members from all parts of the country.

The Morning Session was occupied with discussions on the following subjects:—

(*a*) Fees for agricultural valuations (opened by Mr. R. F. H. Stephenson, Professional Associate) ;

(*b*) Detailed suggestions for increasing the output of foodstuffs (opened by Mr. F. W. C. Chartres, Fellow) ;

(*c*) Valuations in connection with dealing with feeding-stuffs (opened by Mr. W. F. Langridge, Fellow) ;

(*d*) Hire-purchase and short-term credits (opened by Mr. M. D. Bannister, Fellow) ;

(*e*) The Professional (Tithe) Committee. Mr. R. W. Trumper, Fellow (Hon. Secretary of the Committee), gave an explanation of the origin, scope and activities of this Committee.

In the afternoon Mr. G. L. Pepler (Fellow), Chief Town Planning Inspector, Ministry of Health, read a paper on "Town planning as it affects agricultural estates."

The Conference is to be congratulated on the high standard of its proceedings, of which the original and provocative address of Mr. Chartres was an outstanding feature.

The Morning Session's discussion was reported in the *Journal* for February, 1937, and Mr. Pepler's paper and the discussion thereon appeared in the *Journal* for March.

Representatives of the Institution conferred with representatives of the Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute, the Central Landowners' Association, the Land Agents' Society and the National Farmers' Union on the difficulties arising in various parts of the country where tenancy agreements provided for the four-course rotation for arable land. The memorandum drawn up as a result of this Conference appeared in the *Journal* in December, 1936, and an amended version appeared later in the April *Journal*.

The legality of the practice of stamping the counterpart

only of farm tenancy agreements was referred to Counsel, whose opinion appeared in the *Journal* for December, 1936.

It was decided, in view of the satisfactory reception that was accorded to Major Rooke's paper on "Food supplies" in relations to defence," and the address upon the same subject given by Mr. F. W. C. Chartres (Fellow) at the Annual Conference of Agricultural Members, to adopt the views expressed by those two members and to bring them formally before the Government, Members of Parliament and the Agricultural Industry in the form of a memorandum.

The Agricultural Committee have kept a careful watch on developments in mechanised farming, certain aspects of which are likely to be of close concern to the profession.

The sincere thanks of the Council are again due to the Land Agents' Society for their friendly act in inviting members of the Institution to share the hospitality of the Society's Tent at the Royal Show held at Bristol in July last.

The Annual Country Meeting.

By invitation of the Cambridge, Huntingdon, Norfolk and Suffolk Branch, the Annual Country Meeting of 1936 was held in Cambridge from 24th to 27th June. The programme included a reception by the President in the Regent's House Old Schools, by permission of the University of Cambridge ; a civic reception by the Mayor of Cambridge in the Guildhall, followed by papers by the Drapers' Professor of Agriculture and the University Lecturer in Estate Management, which received wide notice ; visits to the Fitzwilliam Museum, the Scott Polar Research Institute, the University Engineering Schools, the University Library, the University Farm, Ely and Ely Cathedral, Newmarket, and to most of the University Colleges ; and the Annual Country Dinner, held by permission of the Master and Fellows of Trinity, in the Great Hall of Trinity College, and attended by the Vice-Chancellor of

the University and other distinguished guests, an occasion which will long be remembered for the ancient beauty of its surroundings and the singing of the Trinity College Choir. The meeting ended with an evening garden party given at their charming home near Cambridge by Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Bidwell to the visiting members, followed by a Ball, arranged by the Junior Branch Committee, at the University Arms Hotel, at which dancing lasted until the small hours.

For the courtesy and hospitality extended to the Institution on the occasion of the meeting the special thanks of the Council are due to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, the Mayor and Corporation of Cambridge, the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Sir John Buchanan Jardine, BT., Mr. C. B. Marriott, the Master and Fellows of Magdalene, Clare, Emmanuel and Downing Colleges, Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Bidwell, and the others who played so great a part in contributing to the success and enjoyment of the meeting.

Special mention must also be made of the services rendered by the Chairman of the Branch (Mr. F. W. C. Chartres), the Hon. Secretary (Colonel C. R. Bennett), Mr. E. P. Weller, Mr. P. C. Gray, and the other members of the Reception Committee, whose enthusiasm and hard work in making the numerous and detailed arrangements were so largely responsible for the success of a meeting of which many pleasant and lasting memories will be retained.

The Junior Organisation.

During the year under review the Junior Organisation has continued through its Committee in London and the Branch Committees throughout the country to play its effective part in the work of the Institution.

During the year a new Junior County Branch was formed in the South Wales Area, bringing the total number of Branches to twenty-one. The majority of the Junior Branches throughout the country have been visited during

the year by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and the Honorary Secretary, who have satisfied themselves that the usefulness of the Junior Organisation and of its Branches is being maintained and developed, and that junior members are continuing to avail themselves of the opportunities which are provided for interesting themselves in the affairs of the Institution.

The following programme of papers was read and discussed at the meetings of the Junior Organisation during the session:—

Date	Subject of Paper.	Author.
1936.		
Nov. 5...	The development of sub-contracting and its effects on building procedure. (Awarded the President's Prize.)	Mr. N. R. Law (Professional Associate).
Dec. 10...	Rating: A defence of the present system. (Awarded the Ryde Memorial Prize by the Chartered Surveyors' (1913) Club.)	Mr. C. H. Smith (Professional Associate).
1937.		
Mar. 22...	An illustrated analysis of the principles of building construction.	Mr. Ian Roberts (Professional Associate).

In addition to the above, three special and exceptionally well-attended meetings were held in London, at which the proceedings were as follows:—

18*th January,* 1936.—Mr. C. M. Kerr, A.M.I.C.E., Assistant Divisional Officer of the London Fire Brigade, gave a Lantern Lecture on the subject of "Fire protection in relation to buildings," which was followed by a demonstration of fire-fighting appliances and apparatus.

11th February, 1937.—A Mock Town Planning Enquiry, arranged by the Middlesex and Urban Essex Branch, was held in the Lecture Hall of the Institution, with Mr. J. A. Rosevear (Fellow) as the Ministry of Health Inspector.

15th April, 1937.—Major R. Ll. Brown, R.E., of the Ordnance Survey Department, gave a Lecture on " The preparation and revision of Ordnance Survey maps " illustrated by lantern slides.

The attendances at London meetings for the year under review show an increase on those recorded last session of 57 per cent. and the average attendance for the year is over 100 per cent. higher than that of three or four years ago. At the meeting on the 11th February a record attendance for any meeting of the Junior Organisation was achieved, there being 208 members present.

The reports of Junior Branch meetings which have appeared in the *Journal* during the year under review show that the level of activity has been fully maintained. Over forty meetings and gatherings have been reported. The formal proceedings have included several lectures on aerial surveying, a popular and topical subject at the present time, a number of mock hearings before an arbitrator, inspector or assessment committee, papers and discussions on various technical and professional subjects, as well as informal outings and gatherings for the purposes of sport or social intercourse.

The Chartered Surveyors' (1913) Club Special Prize was awarded to Mr. C. B. Booth (Professional Associate) for having made the best contribution to the sessional meetings of 1935-1936 otherwise than by the writing of a paper.

In addition to the London members, twenty out of the twenty-one Branches were represented at the Annual Full Committee Meeting, which was held at the Institution on

the 11th December, 1936, to discuss matters of domestic interest.

The Annual Dinner was held at the Park Lane Hotel, Piccadilly, on the 11th December, 1936, when 154 members were present. The guests included the President and the two immediate Past-Presidents of the Institution, Mr. Tristram W. Haward (President of the Land Agents' Society) and other distinguished guests.

Mr. Frank J. Trumper, who had acted with distinction as Hon. Secretary of the Junior Organisation for three years previously, was Chairman for the year under review. Mr. H. Brian Eve (Professional Associate) has served as Hon. Secretary since the beginning of the session with all the ability which was to be expected from a bearer of his name. The Council desire to express their sense of indebtedness both to them and to the members of the Junior Committee, as well as to the members responsible for the work of the Junior Branches, for the zeal and enthusiasm with which they have inspired the interest of the younger members in the Institution.

The Amalgamations.

After more than three years' negotiations the amalgamations with the Scottish Estate Factors' Society and the Faculty of Surveyors of Scotland have been brought to the point of awaiting ratification by His Majesty's Privy Council.

The Council warmly welcome the prospect of amalgamation with these two bodies and the closer contact it will bring about between members of the Institution and their brother surveyors in Scotland.

At a Special General Meeting held on the 5th April, 1937, a resolution was passed approving the scheme for an amalgamation between the Irish Quantity Surveyors' Association and the Institution.

The Publications.

The programme of papers read and discussed at Ordinary General Meetings during the session was as follows:—

Date.	Subject of Paper.	Author.
1936.		
Nov. 9...	The Opening Address ...	The President.
Dec. 7...	Town and country planning as affecting the private landowner—	
	(*a*) From the point of view of a private practitioner;	Mr. C. F. Stone, F.L.A.S. (Fellow).
	(*b*) From the point of view of a clerk to a local authority.	Mr. F. E. Warbreck Howell (Town Clerk, Manchester.
1937.		
Jan. 11...	The nation's food supplies in relation to defence.	Major Nelson Rooke F.L.A.S. (Fellow).
Feb. 8...	Revision of Ordnance Survey 25-inch plans from air photographs.	Major R. Ll. Brown, R.E.
Mar. 1...	The Public Health Act, 1936	Mr. Christopher Chart (Member of Council).
April 5...	Valuation of life interests in real property and revisions.	Mr. F. L. Collins, F.I.A.
May 10...	The rental value of light ...	Mr. G. Leslie Head, A.I. STRUCT.E., M.R.SAN.I.

In addition to the sessional meetings, a special meeting was held at the Institution on the 25th January, 1937, when Colonel W. Garforth, D.S.O., M.C., of the Air Raid Precautions Department, addressed members on the subject of "Air raid precautions: some principles of "protection in air raids."

The attendance of members at Ordinary Meetings has been well maintained, and the Institution is to be congratulated on the high standard of the papers and of the

discussions at these meetings. It may be remarked that several of these papers have commanded considerable attention in the Press.

The thanks of the Council are warmly accorded to the lecturers whose names appear above for the time and labour they have given to the preparation and the delivery of papers, and to those members and others who have enriched the subsequent discussions out of their knowledge and practical experience of the various points raised.

In addition to the Ordinary General Meetings, meetings of members practising as Quantity Surveyors were held on 18th November, 1936, and 17th February, 1937. On the first date discussions were opened by Mr. A. J. Willis (Fellow) and Mr. A. W. Davson (Fellow) respectively on "The possibility of combining the specification with the "bill of quantities especially in small contracts" and on "Simplified quantities and specification for small "contracts." The February meeting was devoted to the discussion of several professional problems arising in the course of a quantity surveyor's practice. Reports on these proceedings appeared in the *Journals* for January, February and April, 1937.

The publications issued by the Institution during the session include the "Memorandum on the Tithe Act, 1936," by Mr. E. L. Mitchell, C.B.E. (Assistant Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture), which was circulated to members in October, 1936.

An innovation was made this year in printing the fixture-card of the Institution containing the sessional programme in the form of a small booklet, approximately similar in form and size to the Schedule of Professional Charges.

The Council, in conjunction with the Councils of the kindred societies subscribing to the Rules of Professional Conduct, have given their consent during the year to the publication of a "Register of Chartered Surveyors, "Chartered Land Agents and of Auctioneers and Estate "Agents," by Messrs. Thomas Skinner & Co., the well-known publishers of the *Bankers' Almanac, The Stock*

Exchange Year Book and other work of reference. The principal object of the Register is to bring to the notice of the public the names and business addresses of those practitioners required to conduct their businesses in accordance with the Rules of Conduct, which are to be set out prominently in the opening pages of the Register.

The Library and Collections.

The value of the Library and Loan Library has been maintained during the year by the purchase of a number of new books on technical and professional subjects, and new editions of old works already in the Library. There have, however, been no purchases of works of outstanding interest calling for individual mention.

Several additions have been made to the Forestry Collection during the year, the most notable being a beech pile from the foundations of Waterloo Bridge which, after 120 years, was found to be in perfect condition. This interesting exhibit was obtained for the Institution through the agency of Mr. Frank W. Hunt, C.V.O. (Member of Council). Progress is being made with a collection of examples of timber showing the effects of various types of fungal disease.

The Institution arranged important exhibits in the Forestry Section of the Royal Show at Bristol and the Joint Show of the Royal Counties and Royal Sussex Agricultural Counties at Worthing. At the former the Institution exhibit was entered in a non-competitive class, but at the latter the Institution was awarded a silver medal in the General Class for a large exhibit dealing with cricket bat willow. Mr. A. D. C. Le Sueur (Fellow), the Curator of the Museum, who arranged these exhibits, is to be congratulated on the results achieved.

Miscellaneous.

The Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute of the United Kingdom celebrated their Golden Jubilee in July,

1936. The congratulations of the Institution were conveyed to the Institute on the occasion of the event.

By instructions of the Council, a letter over the name of the President was published in the professional press challenging the arguments which had been advanced by the President of the Incorporated Association of Rating and Valuation Officers on a public occasion against the employment by rating authorities of private firms of rating surveyors.

The Council have thought it well to remind members of the need for care when signing application forms of candidates for enrolment, examination, election or transfer. The various points which should be borne in mind in this connection were set out in the *Journal* for January, 1937.

Permission has been given by the Council for the formation of a Town Planning Diploma Section, consisting of members of the Institution holding the Special Diploma in Town Planning, and similar in character and objects to the sections already existing among members holding Special Diplomas in Rating and Sanitary Science.

Honours, Awards, Public and Honorary Appointments.

The following honours were graciously conferred upon members by the Sovereign during the year under review:—

The Duke of Beaufort, G.C.V.O. (Honorary Member)	K.G.
Colonel Sir G. L. Courthope, M.C., M.P. (Associate)	Privy Councillor.
Brig.-General W. R. Ludlow, C.B. (Fellow)	K.C.B.
Mr. F. C. Cook (Fellow)	C.B.
Mr. W. L. Jenkins (Fellow)	C.B.E.
Mr. J. O. Nesbitt (Fellow)	O.B.E.
Mr. G. K. Thornhill (Fellow)	O.B.E.
Mr. G. P. Warner Terry (Associate) ...	O.B.E.
Mr. C. E. Westbrook (Professional Associate)	O.B.E.
Mr. A. E. Baylis (Fellow)	M.B.E.

Sir Maurice Gwyer, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., K.C. (Honorary Member), has been appointed the First Chief Justice of India.

Mr. Frank Hunt, C.V.O., has been appointed by the Land Values Reference Committee as an official Arbitrator under the Acquisition of Land (Assessment of Compensation) Act, 1919.

Mr. J. J. McAuley (Fellow) has been appointed as a Referee under the Finance (1909-1910) Act, and Official Arbitrator under the Acquisition of Land (Assessment of Compensation) Act, 1919, for the Irish Free State.

Sir John Oakley, G.B.E., has been re-appointed to serve for a further period of four years on the Crown Lands Advisory Committee, which was originally constituted by the late Prime Minister (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald) in 1933 to advise the Commissioners of Crown Lands upon the development of the Crown's urban estates.

Mr. William Albemarle Fellowes, F.L.A.S. (Professional Associate), has been appointed as His Majesty The King's Agent at Sandringham in succession to Mr. Arthur Clement Beck, C.V.O., F.L.A.S. (Chartered Surveyor), who had been Agent at Sandringham for many years.

Mr. C. Gerald Eve (Past-President) has been nominated to serve on the Departmental Committee appointed by the Ministry of Health to consider and report upon the continuance of the Rent and Mortgage Interest (Restrictions) Acts.

Mr. J. G. Elsworthy (Fellow) was appointed to represent the Institution on the Selection Board which had been set up by the Inland Revenue Department to make appointments in the Grade of Second-Class Valuers, Valuation Office ; and to sit with the Selection Board of the same department for the interviewing of candidates for appointment as Third-Grade Valuers. As the Selection Board sat for several successive days on each occasion Mr. Elsworthy's task was a heavy one.

The President was appointed in the place of Mr. Harry M. Stanley (Past-President) to represent the Institution on the Advisory Board of the School of Planning and Research for National Development, Architectural Association.

Mr. David Edwards, M.INST.C.E. (Fellow), Borough

Engineer and Surveyor of Brighton, has been elected President of the Institution of Municipal and County Engineers.

Mr. C. H. Fox (Fellow) has been elected President of the Institution of Structural Engineers.

Mr. Frederick Peter Mills, M.I.M.E. (Fellow), has been elected President of the North of England Institute of Mining and Mechanical Engineers.

Mr. Oswald Healing (Member of Council) was appointed a member of the Selection Board to interview candidates for appointment as Assistant Surveyors in the Civil Engineer-in-Chief's Department of the Admiralty and in the Works and Buildings Directorate of the Air Ministry.

Mr. Oswald Healing (Member of Council) and Sir Charles Gott, M.INST.C.E. (Member of Council), were nominated to represent the Institution on the Joint Board for the Town Planning Diploma Examinations, Mr. Harold Williams, O.B.E., having expressed a desire to be relieved after several years' valuable service.

Sir Theodore Chambers, K.B.E. (Fellow), was appointed to represent the Institution on the Coronation Planting Committee.

Mr. Robert Cobb (Senior Vice-President) was nominated by the Faculty Board of Agriculture, University of Cambridge, as a member of the Board of Agricultural Studies at the University.

Mr. J. G. Elsworthy (Fellow) was re-appointed to represent the Institution on the Architects' Registration Council for the year beginning March, 1937.

Mr. R. B. Mann (Fellow) was re-appointed to represent the Institution on the Admission Committee of the Architects' Registration Council of the United Kingdom for the year commencing March, 1937.

Mr. A. E. Wevill (Fellow) was appointed by His Excellency the Governor of Kenya to be a member of the Board of Registration of Architects and Quantity Surveyors for the year ending 30th June, 1937.

The following other appointments have been made by the Council during the session in response to invitations from the bodies concerned:—

The Royal Sanitary Institute Health Congress :—

As official delegates: Mr. C. H. SOUTHERN (Fellow) and Mr. G. SYLVESTER TAYLOR (Fellow).

The Thames-side and Medway Industrial Development Board :—

Mr. HENRY F. COBB, C.B.E. (Member of Council).

The British Standards Institution :—

Representative on the Committee for Cast Concrete Roofing Tiles:—Mr. R. T. DADSON, O.B.E. (Fellow), (*vice* Mr. H. J. LEANING (Fellow), deceased).

Representative on the Committee for Bituminous Roofing Felt:—Colonel F. N. FALKNER, O.B.E. (Fellow), (*vice* Mr. H. J. LEANING (Fellow), deceased).

Representative on the Committee for Damp Proof Courses:—Mr. H. J. VENNING (Fellow), (*vice* Mr. H. J. LEANING (Fellow), deceased).

Representative on the Committee for Gypsum Plaster:—Mr. A. W. DAVSON (Fellow), (*vice* Mr. A. G. CROSS (Fellow), deceased).

Finance.

The financial year ended 31st December, 1936, has been one of normal character, and the accounts now presented show that the Institution's sound financial position is being maintained.

The balance of income over expenditure for the year shows the sum of £2,964 17*s.*, which, with the amount of £1,408 1*s.*, received as entrance fees and placed to Capital Account, makes a surplus of income over expenditure of £4,372 18*s.*

ADDENDUM.

Notes from the Reports of the Examiners, 1937.

The object of these notes is to call attention to the defects in the work of candidates in the examinations, in particular to features to which more attention should be paid; and to the respects in which want of preparation was shown. The notes are not primarily intended to be a general review of the examination work for the year.

This year there were fewer reports of bad grammar and spelling, but again the inability of candidates to express themselves clearly and concisely was reported, and in many of the papers the descriptive powers of the candidates was noticeably weak. Marks were frequently lost by careless reading of questions and instructions, or by failure to study their exact meaning, and by the inability of candidates to apportion the time allowed to the amount of work involved. Cases of careless and faulty calculations were reported by the examiners in Book-keeping, Mensuration, and Trigonometry, and Steel Construction.

Agriculture (*Practice*).—The examiner reports that the standard was satisfactory and showed an improvement on that of last year, especially in questions concerning the general trend of farming conditions. Many candidates, however, appeared to have made no effort to study the various types of agriculture not generally adopted in their own particular districts.

Agricultural Law.—The standard is reported as distinctly good. Questions 1 and 3 while on the average well answered showed a lack of knowledge and preparation on the part of some candidates. Very few knew the difference between " illegal " and " irregular " distress.

Agricultural Science.—The work was good and considerable progress over recent years is reported. Weakness was

observed in distinguishing between Insecticides and Fungicides. The papers exhibited a marked degree of knowledge of the principles underlying the residual values of foodstuffs ; the characteristics of leguminosæ and the rotation of crops.

Agricultural Valuations.—The standard was only fair, a lack of practical knowledge being shown by many candidates. Weakness was observed in the ability of candidates to apply the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act to a valuation and to value nursery gardens. Too many candidates expressed the view that the amount of a valuation depended on whether one acted for the landlord or the tenant.

Analysis of Prices.—The examiner reported that the work submitted was only moderate. A lack of knowledge of the cost of working and fixing a handrail and the approximate relative value of bends or wreaths was displayed by candidates. Weakness in knowledge of plumbing work was observed. Too many candidates showed lack of ability to read the questions properly or the preamble to be observed by candidates. Candidates should appreciate that the object of building up an analysis is to arrive at the calculated value to apply to a description. Many candidates worked out a rate by analysis and left a different rate against a previous question where asked to " State the price of." An absence of tidiness and orderliness from the papers was reported. Candidates should not erase by knife, eraser, &c., but should, if corrections must be made, cross out and rewrite.

Book-keeping.—The examiner reports that the standard reached was very poor, many candidates showing themselves ignorant of even the elementary principles of the

subject. A lack of preparation is evident. Candidates are advised to appreciate the value of the subject and to work out exercises in the course of their preparation.

Building Materials.—The examiner reports that the result was most unsatisfactory, showing a lack of knowledge of the whole subject on the part of the majority of the candidates.

Central and Local Government.—Except for the Women's House Property Management Certificate candidates the standard was reported as disappointing, particularly in the subject of Local Government. The question on the borrowing powers of local authorities was poorly answered by nearly every candidate, many failing to distinguish between sums borrowed and grants. Candidates are advised to make a closer study of the principles of Local Government.

Compulsory Purchase Acts.—The general standard was reasonably good, but there was too large a proportion of extremely weak candidates. Many candidates were unable to distinguish clearly between the procedure under the Lands Clauses Acts and that under the Acquisition of Land (Assessment of Compensation) Act, 1919.

Question 7 was the least well answered by the majority of candidates.

Constructive Drawings.—In the final examination the work was only fair and slightly below the standard of last year. A lack of attention to constructive detail was noticeable especially in joinery and woodwork. Weakness was observed in the candidates' knowledge of waterproofing a basement, bonding of brickwork, proper footings to an important wall, methods of casing up binders below ceiling-level, and the assembling of steelwork.

In the Intermediate Examination the work of the typical subject paper was below that of recent years, while a slight

increase was attained in the standard of the non-typical subject papers. The examiner reports that the draughtsmanship was very poor and that a lack of experience and practical knowledge was indicated. In the afternoon paper candidates failed to use modern materials and only three attempted Question 5. Weakness was observed in the candidates' knowledge of the following: Use of correct shapes of bricks, plaster and joinery details, simple lead flat roofs, horizontal damp-proof courses in walls, and window joinery.

Drainage of Buildings.—The work did not reach the standard of last year. Questions 1, 3, 4 and 7 were well done by the majority of the candidates. Question 2 was indifferently done, and there were few who possessed any knowledge of a manhole with closed channels. Weakness was observed in the knowledge of automatic flushing cisterns and syphonage.

Draughtsmanship.—The examiner reports that the standard was disappointing and that it was evident that many of the candidates had had little experience in drawing from field notes. Many candidates had difficulty in enlarging and calculating the area of the example given and used elaborate methods when a simple triangular system would have been more appropriate. More attention should be paid to the importance of accurate scaling with a chain scale to the nearest link and to general lay-out and lettering.

Estate Accounts.—An improvement in the standard was reported. Weakness was observed in the knowledge of the general form in which accounts should be presented to clients. In a large number of cases the apportionment statement required in Question 1 was badly set out. Students are advised to give closer study to the principles involved in the preparation of a balance sheet from a given trial balance.

Farm Homesteads.—A low standard was reported this year, there being evidence of a lack of preparation. The treatment of the leading question on the housing of calves was in the majority of cases unsatisfactory. Few candidates showed adequate knowledge of a suitably fitted calf-shed as distinct from boxes for older stock.

Forestry.—The standard reached is reported as very fair and above the average of recent years. A lack of attention had been given to the study of the preparation of ground and the practical treatment of young mixed coniferous plantations.

In the outdoor paper the work was universally poor. Candidates showed an ignorance of present-day prices and were unable to identify examples of damage by Dutch Elm disease and Elm Bark beetle.

In the Intermediate examination the standard was only fair, a lack of preparation being observed in the identification of leaves and common hardwood species and the restocking of hardwood coppice areas.

Geology.—The standard was better this year than in previous years, there being evidence of much greater care having been paid to the subject. Weakness was observed in the answers to questions like 2 and 10 due to an evident lack of real reading outside the candidates' immediate interests and experience.

Heating and Ventilation.—A much improved standard is reported. The ability to sketch details of actual construction was better than in previous years, and on the whole the work showed a better grasp of the basic principles of the subjects. A number of the candidates showed themselves to be unacquainted with modern developments in heating and ventilating appliances.

Land Drainage.—The standard attained showed improvement on that of last year, but better results would have been obtained by a more careful reading of the questions. Most candidates disclosed a knowledge of the scientific side of the subject, but few had studied the provisions of the Land Drainage Act, 1930.

Law of Arbitrations.—While the general standard attained was very high, many candidates had very little knowledge of the important alterations made by the Arbitration Act of 1934, and too little attention had been given to the provisions of Section 9 of that Act. Nearly all the candidates made the mistake of concluding that fraud must always be a criminal and never a civil wrong. Students are advised to give most careful study to both the principal Act of 1899 and the later Act of 1934.

Law of Dilapidations.—The work was reported as only fair. A lack of study of recent statutes was observed. Students should discover the particular object for which an Act of Parliament was passed and not endeavour to construe an Act for a purpose other than that for which the enactment was made.

Law of Easements.—Again the examiner reports that the standard has fallen and that the work showed a most noticeable lack of preparation. A few candidates failed through attempting to answer four questions instead of three as prescribed by the paper.

Law of Landlord and Tenant.—A satisfactory standard was reported this year. Candidates gave too little attention to the manner in which yearly tenancies could be created and terminated and particularly to the capacity of married women to take or grant leases.

Law relating to Land.—Again a high standard is reported. Weakness was noticeable mostly in the answers to

questions on contract law. Too many candidates wrote of the special rules applicable to contracts for the sale of land as if such rules were applicable to contracts of every kind.

Levelling (Indoor).—The work was satisfactory showing an improved knowledge in the methods of booking and calculating levels. The procedure necessary at change points should have been dealt with in more detail, and weakness was observed in the field side of contour levelling.

Measurement of Builders' Work.—The work was fair showing an improvement on that of last year. Candidates did not show enough care with either the method or the accuracy of the result in the ruling dimensions. Question 1 was not very well answered, and in Question 3 the measurement of the leadwork was very poor.

Measurement of Dilapidations.—The examiner reported a distinct improvement on previous years. There is still a tendency, however, for candidates to write too much on one question at the expense of the others, resulting in many instances to the of survey book extracts being incoherent and untidy. Question 2 was well answered by the majority of the candidates. Candidates this year generally showed a better knowledge of prices.

Mensuration and Trigonometry.—The examiner reports that the standard was unsatisfactory in view of the practical nature of the questions set. The application of trigonometrical functions was again not properly appreciated. The work showed weakness in knowledge of logarithms and carelessness in mathematical calculations. In many cases a complete ignorance was shown in reducing cubic feet to gallons. Students should pay more attention to both subjects and learn to give clear and reasoned answers.

Mines and Minerals.—The work submitted was reported as fair. Only one candidate gave a good answer to Question 1.

Students should acquaint themselves with the provisions of Section 23 of the 1926 Act referring to records of sinkings and borings.

Public Health and Local Government Acts.—Only a fair standard was reached. There appeared to be a lack of knowledge as to (*a*) Liabilities of Local Authorities under varying conditions, (*b*) adoptive Acts, (*c*) Acts mainly applicable to Urban Authorities: to all Highway Authorities: or to Rural Authorities alone. Too little attention was paid to the questions as set, many candidates giving information on subjects not within the scope of the set questions.

Quantities.—In the final examination papers the work submitted was below the average to be expected in this examination. Many of the candidates failed to approach the questions in a practical manner, and did not appear to appreciate the necessity of order and detail in " taking off." More attention should be paid to sufficient and accurate descriptions of the various items.

In the typical paper the standard was not satisfactory. Candidates appeared to lack experience in actual measuring.

In the Intermediate papers the standard was disappointingly low. A lack of attention to method in taking off was noticeable. The majority of items in connection with Question 2 (Morning Paper) were lacking in orderly sequence, while the completion of Queston 1 was generally avoided. The knowledge of foundation work was poor, and only in a few instances were the correct working dimensions calculated by means of " wastes." One question in the dimensions was timesed throughout by 4—only five candidates noticed that one of the timesings had been left out. Again in Question 2 (Morning Paper), which provided for No. 2 pairs of doors, more than half the candidates overlooked the timesing.

Road-making.—The standard was only fair, the worker generally displaying a lack of practical experience of road-

making. The theoretical preparation was good and candidates showed a creditable knowledge of materials, quantities and pricing.

Sanitation of Houses.—The standard is reported as poor. A lack of preparation was observed regarding the requirements affecting hot-water services, very few candidates knowing even the elementary principles. The principles of ensuring movement of air through drains seemed to be entirely unstudied, and students are advised to pay more attention to this important part of the subject, and to such drainage details as accurate levels, designed ventilation and practical working conditions.

Specification of Building.—The examiner reported that the standard was poor. The majority of candidates appeared to have little experience or instruction in the writing of specifications. While the papers displayed a good knowledge of building construction the description was weak. Far too many answers were given by means of sketches in lieu of written descriptions.

Steel Construction.—Compared with last year the standard was lower, and a lack of practical experience is again reported.

Surveying (Indoor).—The work was satisfactory, and showed a considerable improvement on that of the previous year. Candidates had devoted too little study to the meaning and use of rectangular co-ordinates in the plotting of transverse surveys, and a special want of preparation was noticed in the connection between the scale to which a survey is plotted and the accuracy to which the field work should be carried.

Valuations. The Principles of.—The poor standard attained resulted from the candidates' inability to apply

principles to a given set of circumstances. Candidates appeared to have studied detail at the expense of principles.

Valuation of Lands and Buildings.—The examiner reports that the work submitted was disappointing. Although the general principles of investment valuations were appreciated, there were a number of errors in principles which appeared in a great number of papers. These included: Failure to allow for repairs ; Ignorance that trustees may not advance upon mortgage more than two-thirds of a valuation, or that they may advance on very short-term leases ; Valuing the ground rent alone in making the valuation of a leasehold interest ; Failure to include repairs in estimating virtual rent ; Failure to vary number of years' purchase for different classes of property. The papers on the whole indicated a complete lack of practical experience.

Application and Use of Valuation Tables.—The standard was slightly below that of last year. The principal difficulties experienced by the candidates were in connection with the difference between single-rate and dual-rate years' purchase tables, and the elementary use of years' purchase tables for the valuation of life interests.

LIABILITIES.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Sundry Creditors	3,937 10 4	
Subscriptions for 1937 paid in advance	1,189 13 0	
Examinations Fees for 1937 paid in advance... ... ... £7,906 6 0		
Examination Fees carried forward to 1937 .. .. 480 18 0		
	8,387 4 0	
		13,514 7 4
Accumulations Account	47,420 2 9	
Add Entrance Fees received during year—		
Fellows	343 7 0	
Professional Associates, &c.	1,064 14 0	
	48,828 3 9	
Excess of Income over Expenditure for year ended 31st December, 1936	2,964 17 0	
	51,793 0 9	
Less Purchase of Annuity on behalf of David Bennett ... £378 15 10		
Decrease in value of Investments at date 580 2 1		
	958 17 11	
		50,834 2 10
		64,348 10 2

(NOTE.—The above amount of £50,834 2*s.* 10*d.* is subject to increase by the value of Nos. 11 and 12, Great George Street, and the value of the Furniture and Effects of The Institution.)

Trust Funds (as per contra).

Library, Forestry, and Geological Collection ...		7,324 16 10
Prize Endowment Account		5,652 9 2
Scholarship Account—General	16,061 5 9	
" " "Penfold"...	1,536 0 0	
		17,597 5 9
Guarantees to Public Trustee		9 8 3

We have audited the Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet for the year ended 31st December, 1936. We have obtained all the information and explanations that we required; and in our opinion such accounts are properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct state of the affairs of The Institution according to the best of our information, and the explanations given to us, and as shown by the books of The Institution.

TANSLEY WITT & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

5, Chancery Lane, London, W.C. 2.
28*th April*, 1937.

We report that with the assistance of the Chartered Accountants we have examined the foregoing Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1936, and find same to be correct. We have also examined the Deeds and Securities, and certify that they were in possession and safe custody as on the 31st December, 1936.

A. STRACHAN BENNION,
EDWARD J. POULTON,
Hon. Auditors.

28*th April*, 1937.

£94,932 10 2

ASSETS.—General Account.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Cash—						
In hands of Secretary	190	0	0			
At Bank on Deposit Account	4,000	0	0			
„ „ Current „	248	1	0			
				4,438	1	0
Investments, market price 31st December, 1936—						
£15,700 13 0 3½% Conversion Loan @ 106⅛ ...	16,662	6	4			
1,811 1 11 New South Wales 4% (1942-62) Stock @ 101	1,829	4	0			
5,563 19 1 Metropolitan Water Board 3% B Stock @ 98½	5,480	9	11			
3,314 18 7 India 3% Stock @ 84½	2,801	2	4			
11,300 0 0 2½% Funding Stock (1955-61) @ 92 ...	10,396	0	0			
4,000 0 0 London Electric Transport Finance Corporation, Ltd., 2½% guaranteed Debenture Stock (1950/55) @ 93⅓	3,740	0	0			
3,000 0 0 New Zealand 3% Stock (1952-55) @ 96	2,880	0	0			
3,000 0 0 Birkenhead Corporation 3% Redeemable Stock, 1957 @ 100 ...	3,000	0	0			
8,000 0 0 Commonwealth of Australia 2¾% Stock (1941-43) @ 99	7,920	0	0			
4,000 0 0 City of Leicester 3% Redeemable Stock (1958-63) @ 99	3,960	0	0			
				58,669	2	7
Sundry Debtors and amounts paid in advance ...				1,241	6	7
				64,348	10	2
Trust Funds.						
Library, Forestry, and Geological Account.						
Investments, market price 31st December, 1936—						
£3,355 12 8 3½% Conversion Loan @ 106⅛ ...	3,561	3	3			
401 16 9 West Australian 4% Stock @ 101 ...	405	17	1			
Library, Forestry, and Geological Collection ...	2,361	18	0			
	6,328	18	4			
Cash at Bank on Current Account	995	18	6			
				7,324	16	10
Prize Endowment Account.						
Investments, market price 31st December, 1936—						
£503 1 11 India 3% Stock @ 84½	425	2	4			
197 0 0 London Midland and Scottish Railway 4% Debenture Stock @ 106½ ...	209	16	1			
270 0 0 London and North Eastern Railway Second Guaranteed Stock @ 96½ ...	260	11	0			
2,187 10 9 3½% Conversion Loan @ 106⅛	2,321	10	6			
1,059 3 8 2½% Consolidated Stock @ 84¼ ...	892	7	3			
470 3 5 India 3½% Stock @ 98	460	15	4			
500 0 0 Courage & Co. 3½% Debenture Stock @ 99	495	0	0			
202 9 10 3½% War Loan @ 105¼	213	2	6			
	5,278	5	0			
Cash at Bank on Current Account	374	4	2			
				5,652	9	2
Scholarships Account.						
Investments, market price 31st December, 1936—						
£9,290 3 1 3½% Conversion Loan @ 106⅛ ...	9,859	3	6			
1,988 1 7 Metropolitan Water Board 3% B Stock @ 98½	1,958	5	2			
1,813 3 0 Queensland 4% Stock (1940-50) @ 102	1,849	8	3			
2,324 14 0 New Zealand 4% Stock (1943-63) @ 103	2,394	8	10			
1,600 0 0 Canadian Pacific Railway 4% Debenture Stock @ 96	1,536	0	0			
				17,597	5	9
Guarantees to Public Trustee.						
Cash at Bank on Current Account				9	8	3
				£94,932	10	2

EXPENDITURE. FOR THE YEAR END

1935. £	s.	d.		1936. £	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1,949	7	3	To *Journal:* Reporting and Publication	1,983	3	4			
753	5	5	Postage	784	11	9			
2,702	12	8		2,767	15	1			
240	10	0	*Less* Amount received from *Journal* Advertisements...	232	10	0			
2,462	2	8					2,535	5	1
68	6	6	„ Publications issued during year:—						
	—		Housing Act, 1935: A Précis ...	170	1	11			
			Town Planning: England and Wales, List of Schemes showing present Position	177	15	6			
	—		Tithe Act, 1936: Memorandum...	41	7	3			
	—								
68	6	6					389	4	8
			„ London and County Branches and						
3,231	15	0	Junior Organisation	3,461	14	9			
272	8	1	„ Country Meeting at Cambridge ...	353	19	7			
3,504	3	1					3,815	14	4
1,380	0	0	„ Ground Rent	1,380	0	0			
			„ Rates and Taxes, Corporation Duty,						
2,283	3	11	and Insurance	2,675	18	0			
40	7	1	„ Staff Endowment Insurance... ...	40	7	1			
3,703	11	0					4,096	5	1
6,259	11	4	„ Salaries	6,603	1	3			
830	6	6	„ Wages	846	1	3			
575	0	0	„ Staff Superannuation Fund	748	10	0			
7,664	17	10					8,197	12	6
380	10	2	„ Fuel, Light, and Water	448	19	0			
375	16	11	„ Stationery and Account Books ...	406	14	2			
1,446	8	5	„ Printing and Lithography	1,148	10	8			
			„ Postage, Receipt Stamps, and						
754	17	3	Telephone	823	7	4			
158	10	9	„ Law Charges	196	2	8			
			„ Do. (Amalgamation of the Scottish Estate Factors' Society with the						
	—		Institution)	194	5	9			
121	3	0	„ Parliamentary Papers & Periodicals	102	16	2			
223	13	0	„ Repairs and Fittings	171	19	5			
			„ Re-furnishing and Renovating of						
179	13	0	Portraits	—					
	—		„ Office & Printing Room Equipment	146	9	3			
698	16	5	„ Donations for Professional Objects	702	12	4			
5	5	0	„ Standard Method of Measurement	—					
1,171	13	3	„ House Account and Sundries ...	1,091	1	6			
5,516	7	2					5,432	18	3
£22,919	8	3	Carried forward				£24,466	19	11

:CEMBER, 1936. INCOME.

1935. £	s.	d.		1936. £	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1,410	7	0	By Fellows' Subscriptions	11,499	12	0			
8,037	15	0	„ Professional Associates', Colonial Fellows' and Associates' Subscriptions	8,403	3	0			
581	14	0	„ Students' Subscriptions	437	17	0			
1,046	7	0	„ Probationers' Subscriptions... ...	1,148	14	0			
18	18	0	„ Women's House Property Managers' Subscriptions	25	4	0			
21,095	1	0					21,514	10	0
1,027	9	10	„ Interest on Investments (*less* Tax)...				1,163	5	3
80	10	10	„ Interest on Deposit at Bank ...				74	9	7
388	13	6	„ Hire of Rooms...				476	5	6
900	0	0	„ Rent of Leasehold Property :— No 11, Great George Street, S.W. 1				900	0	0
			„ The Standard Method of Measurement				500	0	0
			SCHOLARSHIPS ACCOUNT :—						
476	2	8	Interest on Investments (*less* Tax)				472	11	4
3,967	17	10					25,101	1	8
			EXAMINATIONS ACCOUNT :—						
7,187	15	6	By Candidates' Fees	6,881	7	6			
176	5	11	„ Sale of Syllabus	185	18	10			
7,364	1	5					7,067	6	4

£31,331 19 3	Carried forward ...	£32,168 8 0

1935. £	s.	d.	Expenditure—(*cont.*)	1936. £	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
22,919	*8*	*3*	Brought forward				24,466	19	11
168	*16*	*5*	To Publicity Account	416	2	5			
159	*13*	*3*	,, Expenses of Jubilee of H.M. King George V.	—					
109	*3*	*8*	,, The International Federation of Surveyors	303	6	5			
437	*13*	*4*					719	8	10
			,, Scholarships Account :—						
324	*4*	*4*	Terms' Fees, &c.				330	13	4
			,, Examinations Account :—						
2,099	*18*	*5*	Examiners' and Moderators' Fees	2,161	14	0			
653	*5*	*3*	Advertising, Printing and Stationery	706	1	5			
506	*7*	*6*	Hire of Hall and Instruments ...	628	12	8			
49	*6*	*9*	Prizes	48	4	4			
280	*18*	*11*	Sundry Disbursements	141	16	6			
3,589	*16*	*10*					3,686	8	11
27,271	*2*	*9*					29,203	11	0
4,060	*16*	*6*	,, Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Accumulations Account				2,964	17	0
£31,331	*19*	*3*					£32,168	8	0

1935.			Income—(*cont.*)			1936.		
£	*s.*	*d.*				£	*s.*	*d.*
31,331	*19*	*3*	Brought forward	...	...	32,168	8	0
£31,331	*19*	*3*				£32,168	8	0

LIBRARY, FORESTRY, AND

1936.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Dec. 31st. To Purchase of Books and Maps, &c. :—			
Reference Library ...	153 19 7		
Loan Library	17 7 6		
		171 7 1	
„ Annual Subscriptions ...	2 2 0		
„ Honorarium to Forestry Curator	52 10 0		
„ Grant to Branch Library ...	35 11 0		
		90 3 0	
„ Insurance	8 15 0		
„ Stationery, Printing and Postage	5 9 3		
„ Binding	13 15 8		
„ Sundry Disbursements ...	13 19 7		
		41 19 6	
„ Expenses of Forestry Exhibits at Royal and Royal Counties Agricultural Shows		36 16 0	
			340 5 7
„ Depreciation		175 19 9	
„ Decrease in Value of Investments ...		37 15 1	
			213 14 10
„ Balance carried forward to 1937 :—			
£3,355 12*s.* 8*d.* 3½ % Conversion Loan @ 106⅛		3,561 3 3	
£401 16*s.* 9*d.* West Australian 4% Inscribed Stock @ 101 ...		405 17 1	
Value of Books, Forestry and Geological Collections... ...		2,361 18 0	
		6,328 18 4	
Cash at Bank		995 18 6	
			7,324 16 10
			£7,878 17 3

EOLOGICAL ACCOUNT.

1936.		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Jan. 1st.	By Balance brought forward from 1935 ...				7,141	7	4
Dec. 31st.	„ Increased Value at this date :—						
	Books purchased	171	7	1			
	„ presented	20	0	0			
					191	7	1
	„ Dividends (*less* Tax)				102	12	10
	„ Donations				443	10	0
					£7,878	17	3

"PRIZE ENDOWMENT

1936.		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Dec. 31st.	To Amount paid for:—						
	"Beadel" Prize	7	17	6			
	"Driver" Prize	16	16	0			
	"Crawter" Prize	10	4	8			
	"Penfold" Gold and Silver Medals ...	22	15	0			
	"Mellersh" Prize	5	0	0			
	"Wainwright" Prize	40	13	2			
	"Daniel Watney" Travelling Scholarship	15	0	0			
	"Galsworthy" Prize	23	3	7			
	"Julian Rogers" Scholarship... ...	28	8	0			
	"John Gilchrist" Prize	4	7	0			
	"Hyman Marks" Prize...	6	6	0			
					180	10	11
	„ Decrease in Value of Investments ...				22	17	10
	„ Balance carried forward to 1937 viz.:—						
	Being Investments at market price, 31st December, 1936—						
	£503 1*s.* 11*d.* India 3% Stock @ 84½	425	2	4			
	£197 London Midland & Scottish Railway 4% Debenture Stock @ 106½	209	16	1			
	£270 London & North Eastern Railway Second Guaranteed Stock @ 96½	260	11	0			
	£2,187 10*s.* 9*d.* 3½% Conversion Loan @ 106⅛	2,321	10	6			
	£1,059 3*s.* 8*d.* 2½% Consolidated Stock @ 84¼	892	7	3			
	£470 3*s.* 5*d.* India 3½% Stock @ 98	460	15	4			
	£500 Courage & Co. 3½% Debenture Stock @ 99	495	0	0			
	£202 9*s.* 10*d.* 3½% War Loan @ 105¼	213	2	6			
					5,278	5	0
	„ Cash at Bank				374	4	2
					£5,855	17	11

CCOUNT, 1936.

1936.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Jan. 1st.	By Balance brought forward from 1935 ...		5,670 16 10
Dec. 31st.	„ Dividends for year to date (*less* Tax) and Income Tax returned to April, 1936 :—		
	"Beadel" Bequest	7 16 8	
	"Driver" Bequest	16 9 0	
	"Crawter" Bequest"	10 14 8	
	"Penfold" Bequest	15 0 0	
	"Mellersh" Bequest	5 0 5	
	"Wainwright" Bequest	26 10 5	
	"Daniel Watney" Gift	24 16 0	
	"Daniel Watney" Gold Medal ...	20 12 8	
	"Galsworthy" Gift	18 17 7	
	"Julian Rogers" Bequest	19 13 0	
	"John Gilchrist" Bequest ...	4 7 0	
	"Hyman Marks" Bequest ...	7 1 8	
			176 19 1
	By Excess Expenditure carried to General Account :—		
	"Penfold" Bequest	7 15 0	
	"Julian Rogers" Bequest ...	0 7 0	
			8 2 0
			£5,855 17 11

J. B. NICHOLS AND SONS, LTD.,
PARLIAMENT MANSIONS,
VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER